

THE SECOND REFORM

BX
5093
W3

John Williams Charles
^{BY}
J. W. C. WAND, *Bp. of London.*
Bishop of London 1835 -

LONDON

THE FAITH PRESS, LTD.

7 TUFTON STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W. I

MOREHOUSE - GORHAM CO., NEW YORK, U.S.A.

First published, January, 1953

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN
in 10pt. Baskerville type
BY THE FAITH PRESS, LTD.
LEIGHTON BUZZARD

CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHAPTER I	
ORGANIZATION	I
I. Periods of change. Early nineteenth century. Effect of revolution.	
II. Eighteenth century—redeeming features. Abuses. No central organization.	
III. Blomfield—central figure in reform.	
IV. Finance: Church rates. Ecclesiastical commissioners (Sees, Chapters, Parishes. Opposition.) Tithe.	
V. Building: Need. Church Building Society. Blomfield's contribution.	
VI. Government. Convocations. Ecclesiastical Courts. Privy Council. Church Discipline Act. Bishop as executive officer. Rural Deans.	
CHAPTER II	
LIFE	18
I. Education: Early history. Sunday Schools. Bell and Lancaster. National and British Societies. Joshua Watson. Utilitarians. London. Durham. Theological Colleges.	
II. Evangelization: <i>Home</i> . Religious Tract Society. Hannah More. C.P.A. A.C.S. Bible Society. <i>Foreign</i> . New Bishoprics. Colonial and Continental Church Society. Colonial Bishoprics' Fund. C.M.S.	
III. Worship: Difficulties of estimate. Antipathy to Rome. The Eucharist. Music and hymns. Daily offices.	
CHAPTER III	
SPIRIT	34
(Liberals and Evangelicals)	
I. Religion and reform. Liberals. Oriel Noetics. Arnold, Milman and Jowett. Christian Socialists. Effects of Liberalism.	
II. Evangelicals: Charles Simeon. Second generation. Proprietary chapels. Clapham Sect. Wilberforce. Shaftesbury. Eclectic Society. Islington. The Wilsons. Evangelical bishops (Ryder and the Sumners). Low Churchmen. Apostolicals. Split on Reformation and surplice.	

	PAGE
CHAPTER IV	
SPIRIT	51
(Anglo-Catholics)	
I. The new influence. Coleridge.	
II. The opening moves. Assize sermon. (Reform Bill: Ireland.) Rose at Hadleigh. Oriel. Froude's platform. Sacraments. Moralism.	
III. Effects. Apostolicity of Church. Succession. Attitude to State. Independence. Colleges and churches. Charity. Ritualism. Rubrics. Convents.	
IV. Gorham Judgment. Results: diverse tendencies held together. Lay influence.	
BOOKS FOR FURTHER READING	66
PRINCIPAL DATES	67

PREFACE

THE announcement of my Lent lectures this year aroused some speculation in the Diocese as to what was meant by the “Second Reform.” Even the kindly and dignified clerics who took the chair at the several meetings avowed themselves consumed with curiosity (not unmixed with anxiety) on this point. I hope that the mere existence of such doubt provides sufficient justification for drawing attention to the crucial importance of the early nineteenth century in the development of *Ecclesia Anglicana*.

† WM. LONDIN :

CHAPTER I

ORGANIZATION

I

It is sometimes said that Englishmen are interested in only two epochs of Church history—the primitive age and that of the Reformation. If there is any truth in the statement it is a great pity. History of course is one whole and any attempt to divide it into watertight compartments is bound to lead to misunderstanding. This is not to say that there are no especially creative periods. During some ages the stream of history moves slowly and placidly, at other times it rushes with torrential force into cataracts which alter its course and dictate its channel for many generations. Such a revolutionary period was the Reformation, covering the greater part of the sixteenth century. But it was not the only one. The purpose of these lectures is to suggest that for the Church of England there was a second period of rapid change, deserving the name of the Second Reform. It occupied the first half of the nineteenth century.

It is customary to date the beginning of what is called “modern” Church history from the period of the first Reformation. This is so deeply rooted a convention that it can probably never be changed. Nevertheless a careful examination will reveal its falsity. The centuries immediately succeeding the first Reform have in many respects more in common with the medieval period than with modern history. In the sixteenth century Anglicanism enjoyed its formative period. In the seventeenth we find it fighting for its existence and establishing itself firmly in the pattern of English life. During the eighteenth century it suffered a certain measure of recession and decay, while the outer bastions of the Christian faith, belief in the Trinity, the Incarnation and a special revelation, were being defended against the Deists. It was in the beginning of the nineteenth century that a root and branch reform of the Church was effected. Changes then

took place in its organization, its inner life, and even in its doctrinal emphasis which led to an unprecedented expansion and dictated the course of its development down to the present time. It is the early nineteenth century which forms the introduction to modern Church history.

In secular history the importance of the early nineteenth century has long been recognized. It was the French Revolution and its consequences that put a final end to medieval forms and proved, in the true sense of the phrase, epoch-making. In many departments it represented a complete reversal of customary modes of thought, and it issued in political and social changes which are still going on. In ecclesiastical history we have been much more slow to recognize the upheaval that then took place. This may be because the two spheres have been kept too distinct. It is perhaps inevitable that writers should concentrate upon the particular field that interests them most, but men do not live their lives in watertight compartments, and a decided change in one sphere is bound to have its repercussions in another. In fact the religious and secular spheres impinge upon each other far more directly than would be concluded from the reading of Church histories. At the time of the French Revolution it was expected by many that the fall of the Church would follow closely upon that of the Empire. In our own country the National Church, which had been failing to keep its hold on the growing population, was called upon to prevent a violent revolution in imitation of the French example. Indeed the Church did represent a conservative element and made for stability in the whole communal life. Nevertheless, although the Church may have helped to prevent an outbreak of violence, it was bound itself to feel the effects of the overturning of authority and the re-examination of every question in the secular sphere. In any case conditions began to change in England, though without producing the same cataclysm that had occurred in France. Men's minds were astir, medieval abuses could no longer be tolerated. Society was not willing to be regarded as fixed for ever in rigid moulds. The Church had to adapt itself to the changing circumstances. It was this necessity that provided the occasion for the Second Reform.

II

To realize how badly the Church needed reform we have only to recognize the condition of things as they then were. We must of course guard against the habit of painting a period in the blackest colours in order to show how bright in contrast its immediate successor can appear. That is mere partisanship and not sober history. There were in fact quite a number of redeeming features in the Church of the eighteenth century. Its scholars did able and necessary work in the field of Apologetics. In an age when serious attacks were being made on the Church's faith they managed to justify the fundamental doctrines of the creed and prevented England from following in the footsteps of the French encyclopædists. No doubt the Church would have appeared in even better colours if it had not already lost some of the finest exponents of its piety in the Non-Juring Schism. Nevertheless that schism itself preserved a high standard of churchmanship and it was not without a powerful influence on the Church of the future. As always it was in the work of the parishes that the efficiency of the Establishment could best be judged. Though even there, as we shall see presently, there were many scandals, yet both in town and country there were fine examples of devotion to duty. In Leeds parish church, for instance, it was the custom of the staff of three priests to attend for marriages from eight to eleven-thirty every day, for baptisms and churchings twice every day, and they were ready to perform burials three times a day in summer and twice a day in winter. In the country parish of Stretton the vicar could claim that he had 244 actual communicants in his church out of a total population of 610. While such work was going on the condition of the Church could not have been wholly bad.

Nevertheless, it must be admitted that outside the ranks of the Non-Jurors very few even of the clergy had any adequate idea of the Church as a distinct entity. King and Parliament had taken the place of the medieval Pope, and the officers of the Church were to a large extent the mouthpiece of the Government. Although the bishops did not hold high offices of state as they had done in the Middle Ages, it was a period of worldly prelates. The Latitudinarian views of the bishops

chimed together with the Whig ascendancy in Parliament. The bishops spent much of their time in their London houses and voted regularly in the House of Lords with the Government.

Many medieval abuses were still prevalent. One third of the clergy were pluralists, even more of them were non-resident. Quite a number of adjacent parishes might be left without a single resident clergyman. Even where there was a resident priest, he might be an assistant curate "passing rich on £40 a year." By contrast the bishops and people in high office felt no shame in appointing their own relatives to the more lucrative livings. Spark of Ely was a notorious example. He had two sons and a son-in-law netting between them £20,000 a year out of the Church's money. There was a glaring contrast between the wealth of the hierarchy and the poverty of many parochial incumbents. While the Archbishop of Canterbury received £27,000 a year, and the Bishop and Chapter of Durham enjoyed coal royalties of such a magnitude that the amount was never made known, there were thousands of "livings" with an annual income of less than £150.

These abuses were very largely due to the fact that there was still no central organization for the Church. Queen Anne's Bounty distributed to the poorest clergy the income from the annates confiscated by Henry VIII and restored by Queen Anne, but there was no other means of effecting from the centre any redistribution of the Church's income. Convocation had been silenced and there was no instrument by which the clergy could give a united voice to their desires or complaints. What central ecclesiastical government there was came mostly from King and Parliament. Consequently the more important of the local clergy were content to represent the State as well as the Church in their parishes. Many of them were magistrates or Justices of the Peace and often the parson exercised also the other functions of the Squire. Attention to purely priestly duties diminished. Church buildings were often in a deplorable state. Decay was to be seen not only in the village churches, but in many of the cathedrals and the great town churches that had been built by the munificence of former generations. It has often been

told how S. Paul's itself had become little more than an "alley on change."

Towards the end of the eighteenth century the Church was becoming increasingly unpopular. The confidence shown in the bishops during Anne's reign had died out, and as the nation began to reform civil abuses it resented more and more the retention of parallel abuses in the Church. This resentment was shown most vividly in the next century at the period of the Reform Bill, which was at first resisted by the bishops. Rioters burnt the palace of the Bishop of Bristol; and Archbishop Howley when he arrived in Canterbury for his Primary Visitation was pelted by a furious mob.¹

III

In no sphere was reformation more needed than in that of organization and finance. It was here that ultimately the practical genius of the English people showed itself most clearly and that reform was most thorough-going and successful. The hero of it was the Bishop of London, Charles James Blomfield, a man to whose importance in the history of the Church too little attention has been paid.

He was a person of great parts. The son of a schoolmaster, he early showed considerable academic ability. When he went up to Trinity, Cambridge, he worked from twelve to fifteen hours a day, and this strenuous labour told heavily upon his nervous temperament. Nevertheless he won the University prizes for both Latin and Greek odes, and graduated as Third Wrangler. Classics rather than mathematics formed the field of his future reading, and his early publications were all studies in classical literature. In order to earn a competence he continued teaching after he was ordained. He then became Domestic Chaplain to Howley, at that time Bishop of London, who later appointed him to the living of S. Botolph's, Bishopsgate, the wealthiest living in the diocese. Presently he became Archdeacon of Colchester, which was then in the diocese of London. At the age of 38 he was made

¹ It was on this occasion that his chaplain complained that someone had thrown a dead cat in his face, only to be met by the Archbishop's cool rejoinder, "You should think yourself very lucky that it was not a live one."

Bishop of Chester. Financially this was worth only £1,400 a year (not all the bishoprics possessed incomes sufficient for their responsibilities), but he was allowed to retain S. Botolph's *in commendam*.

The diocese of Chester was in a poor state, but Blomfield did a titanic work of rehabilitation during his four years of office. On one occasion he confirmed nearly 8,000 candidates in the course of six days. He set to work to reform the clergy and to take special care of the ordinands. In spite of all his diocesan activity he managed to preach often at S. Botolph's and to do a full share of duty in the House of Lords. He was of course a man of his time. Although he was very anxious for the clergy to mend their manners he was equally desirous that they should stand well with the nobility and gentry. Sydney Smith wrote some characteristic lines as a paradigm of Blomfield's first charge to the clergy of the Chester diocese :

" Hunt not, fish not, shoot not,
Dance not, fiddle not, flute not ;
But before all things it is my particular desire ;
That once at least in every week you take
Your dinner with the Squire."²

In 1828 he became Bishop of London. He was at the time in full sympathy with the Whig leaders. He had supported them in the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, and so had helped to make life more tolerable for the Nonconformists, but he broke with them over the Roman Catholic Emancipation to which he was violently opposed. At the first division over the Reform Bill he would have liked to vote in favour but he would not betray the rest of his episcopal colleagues who were solid against it. The next year, however, when the Bill was again before the Lords, he voted for it and carried some of the other bishops with him. This showed an unusually enlightened view on political and social conditions for his time.

It was as Bishop of London that he performed his great work in the reform of Church organization to which the succeeding sections of this lecture will be devoted. In the

² Carpenter, *Church and People*, p. 91.

meantime we may notice that for a scholar he showed a quite unusual grasp of affairs. Sydney Smith speaks of his "un-governable passion for business." He performed almost incredible labours in spite of repeated bouts of ill-health. Towards the end this showed itself in attacks of paralysis, which I suppose we should interpret as a succession of strokes. Finally he felt that he could no longer carry on the work of his diocese. In 1854, together with the invalid Bishop of Durham, he obtained an Act of Parliament enabling him to resign. This he was allowed to do on a retiring pension of £6,000 and he was permitted to keep Fulham Palace as a residence.

An early biographical note is so completely illustrative of his character and so obviously reveals the sentiment of his time that it is worth quoting at considerable length :

" His stature, when in the prime of life, was above the middle height, and his personal appearance was strongly expressive of the scholar and the man of business. The aspect of his brow and head impressed a sense of his perceptivity and mental power on even the most cursory beholder, and was considered by phrenologists as affording a splendid verification of their science. His manner seemed to strangers to be abrupt, and his demeanour haughty; but those who knew him best believe that his heart was kind, and his disposition cheerful, though occasionally beclouded in private by physical causes. He entertained the social circle with the fund of his anecdotes, the stores of his reading, and the versatility of his wit. He was a very early riser; and, by skilful management, found time for an amazing multitude of most efficient labours, and even for literary pursuits. As a debater in Parliament whenever his official position required him to share in its discussions, he was vigorous and lucid. As a preacher, he combined the clearest statements of doctrinal truth, with the most forcible and persuasive inferences from them of practical obligation. He retained, indeed, the large revenues of his see, whose net annual value was recently returned by himself at £16,513, even after other prelates had consented to a limitation of theirs, but he distributed out of his abun-

dance with an unsparing hand to church-building, the funds of schools, and the relief of the poorer clergy; and chiefly by life insurance provided for his six sons and five daughters. His 'infirmities' of which, in his first charge to the clergy of London, he professed himself, with a falling tear, to be 'deeply conscious,' were perhaps mainly attributable to his constitution of body, and the peculiar and increasing difficulties of the course he had to steer, from the time he became Bishop of London until his resignation. As might reasonably be expected, he left the world divided into two opposite parties in their opinions of his principles and conduct; and, as *The Times* (August 7th, 1857) remarked, when noticing his death, 'The day may yet be far distant when the boundary line will be finally adjusted between the opposite classes of those who indiscriminately admire him on the one hand, and criticize him unkindly on the other.'

IV

The most immediate need was for a reform in Church finance. Apart from the endowment income from land, the regular flow of support for the general purposes of the Church was derived from tithe, rates, and pew rents. No final changes were made during our period in these three sources of income. The most hotly debated question was that of Church rates. They were regarded as especially obnoxious by the Dissenters because they were devoted to the upkeep of the Church fabric. While the rectors were responsible for repairs to the chancel, the repairs of the rest of the church had to be maintained by the parish. As the number of Dissenters increased they complained loudly at being compelled to support a religion in which they did not believe and to pay for the maintenance of a building which they did not use. In the rare cases where they could command a majority on the vestry, they contested the actual levying of the rate. In one notorious case, that of the parish of Braintree, an effort was made by the churchwardens to levy the rate in spite of the fact that they could not win a vote on the vestry. Their action was opposed at law with varying success, but in the end when the case had gone through no fewer than eight

courts it was decided that they had no power to levy a rate apart from the vestry, and that they had no redress in law for the refusal of the vestry to levy a rate. The only action that could be taken to support them would have been to revert to medieval practice and to put the parish under an interdict. As that penalty had become obsolete there was no way out of the difficulty. On the other hand, a parishioner who refused to pay a rate once legally levied could be dealt with by the law. An individual named Thorogood, a Non-conformist living at Chelmsford, who refused payment of 5s. 6d., was committed to prison for contempt of court. This of course did the Church more harm than good: the country generally was revolted at the sight of a person being committed to prison for a religious scruple. The Government tried to bring in a bill to put an end to the Church rate, but both Howley and Blomfield spoke against it in the House of Lords. They regarded such a measure as the first step in a wholesale attack upon the Church's finances. The bill was dropped. Opposition however grew in strength until after our period was over the question was finally settled by putting an end to the compulsory rate. A voluntary rate continued to be levied in some parts of the country and indeed has not yet entirely died out.

In the meantime far more important steps had been taken towards ending the confusion in which the whole question of Church finance stood. Even before the Reform Bill was passed a Commission had been set up to enquire into the facts. This continued to sit from 1831 to 1835. When it had reported a new Commission was set up in 1836 to carry out the proposed changes. Thus was inaugurated the body known as the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for England and Wales, to whose good management the Church was to owe so much during the next hundred years. Blomfield himself has been described as the life and soul of the Commission. "Till Blomfield comes," said the Archbishop of York,³ "we all sit and mend our pens—and talk about the weather." The body consisted of the two archbishops, three bishops, five officers of state, and three laymen. Later it was considerably enlarged to include all the diocesan bishops as well as certain

³ Carpenter, *op. cit.*, p. 98.

other officers of state, together with five judges. They were given powers to reform the whole episcopal and capitular property of the Church. They formed a common fund, and into it they passed what they pared off from individual endowments regarded as too great for present necessities. With the money thus obtained they proceeded to effect more than merely financial reforms. They founded new sees at Manchester and Ripon and redetermined the boundaries of a number of dioceses. The ancient see of Durham was deprived of its secular palatine jurisdiction and reduced in income from about £27,000 to £7,000. Canterbury was reduced to £15,000, York and London to £10,000 and Winchester to £8,000. The money thus saved was used in an effort to raise the poorer sees to an average of £4,000—£5,000 a year.

At the same time the capitular bodies were reorganized. Each chapter, with a few exceptions, was to consist henceforth of a dean and four residentiary canons. Prebendaries and non-residentiary canons were reduced for the most part to honorary titles, and the money derived from this source was used for the augmentation of poor livings.

The administration of ecclesiastical property was also reformed. In particular a system of short leases was substituted for the old system of fines on beneficial leases which, however helpful to the immediate lessor, had told heavily in the long run against good management. The first reforms were carried out by separate Acts of Parliament, but later it was made possible for the Commissioners to proceed by procuring Orders in Council.

An overdue effort was made to deal with the evil of pluralities by the passing of the Church Pluralities Act in 1838. This provided that not more than two preferments could be held together by the same person. Even so it could only be done under a special licence from the Archbishop, and on the condition that the two benefices concerned were less than ten miles apart. On the other hand, small neighbouring parishes could be united and over-large ones could be divided. Thus there was still some flexibility in parochial organization.

These reforms did not go through without difficulty. Some of the bishops thought they went too far in that they were

contrary to the oath taken by cathedral authorities to protect the rights and privileges of their order. Also of course there were not wanting those who wished to maintain the position of the well-to-do clergy. Archbishop Howley, however, duly prompted by Blomfield, defended the reforms. He pointed out that owing to the breakdown of the parochial system there were in the country as many as three million souls without spiritual care. One could not set against them the claims of four hundred clergymen. Blomfield was not afraid to expose abuses in his own diocese. He pointed out that the incomes accruing to the cathedral church of S. Paul amounted to something like £24,000 a year. Of the clergy who shared in that income twenty-nine held positions which were little more than sinecures. At the same time within a mile or two to the east and north-east of the cathedral there was an immense population, to the number of at least 300,000, living in a state of great destitution ; and to serve them there was only one church and one clergyman for each 10,000 souls. As a result of the work of the Commission ten parishes in Bethnal Green alone were endowed out of the S. Paul's prebends.

Within the succeeding fifty years the common fund of the Commissioners endowed or augmented no fewer than 5,300 livings and made grants of which the total yearly value amounted to £739,000. They adopted the policy of making grants to meet local benefactions of a similar amount. By this means in the same period they attracted private gifts to the capital value of four and a half million pounds. No doubt it is possible to criticize some of the work done, but at the present time those criticisms are generally confined to a regret that some means was not found of reorganizing the cathedrals in a less drastic way so that they could have conferred greater benefits upon the spiritual life of the community. However, with the state of feeling in the country as it was, many believed that instead of going too far the Commissioners had not gone far enough.

While these reforms were going forward attempts were also being made to get rid of the unpleasant feeling engendered by the payment of tithe. It was not that people generally thought that tithe itself was an unjust exaction. They knew

that it had been given to the Church in former days by generous benefactors and that proper allowance for it was always made when sale or lease of land was negotiated. What was found objectionable was the method of collecting it. It could be estimated on the results of actual personal labour in the mills and elsewhere, but more normally it was levied on the produce of the fields and was collected in kind. Many voluntary attempts had been made to ease the burden. The clergy generally had refused to collect it when it was levied on personal labour. There had also been many voluntary commutations of tithe so that it could be paid by a fixed charge rather than in kind. But tithe did not go to the clergy only. In many cases it had passed with ecclesiastical property into the hands of lay impro priators who had inherited abbey lands confiscated from the Church in the reign of Henry VIII. There were also colleges and other bodies to whom tithe had to be paid. Naturally there was much controversy from time to time about the amounts and about the correct sum to be paid in commutation. Altogether every one was anxious that something should be done. The clergy were particularly desirous that the relations between themselves and those from whom they collected their tithe should be improved. No one suggested as a serious proposition that the payment of tithe should be abandoned altogether. That would have been too revolutionary a proposal, and there was no obvious means by which the clergy and others could be reimbursed for the loss of tithe.

In the end a bill, promoted by Lord John Russell, succeeded in passing both Houses and received the Royal Assent in 1836. By this Act commutation was made compulsory. The basis of valuation was a septennial average of the price of corn. This was a tremendous step forward. Since the passing of this Act (as Warre Cornish⁴ points out) no tithes have been paid in kind. As such they ceased to exist but were replaced by a rent charge payable to the tithe owner, whether clerical, corporate or lay. This meant the universal substitution of a money tax for a tenth of the produce. Short

⁴ *History of the English Church in the Nineteenth Century*, Part I, p. 121.

of getting rid of tithe altogether, this was perhaps the most satisfactory possible solution of a very unpleasant problem.

V

One of the most important spheres of reform was that of Church building. At the opening of the nineteenth century the accommodation provided in the churches was not nearly sufficient to meet the need. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the naves had been so full that vast galleries had to be built to accommodate the congregations. Even the growing unpopularity of the Church at the beginning of the nineteenth century was to some extent balanced by the quite unprecedented growth of population. It was said that one of the reasons why the Church had failed to maintain its hold upon the masses was that it simply had not enough churches in which to instruct them. Similarly one of the reasons for the success of dissenting bodies was that their cheap but roomy buildings provided a more homely setting for a great proportion of the people than the stately parish church. In the national churches accommodation was further reduced by the style of pews with which they were then disfigured. Pews of course were rented and were often made sufficiently large to accommodate a whole family together with their guests. This meant that they were often far from full. It meant also that if a parson were unpopular the empty pews could be kept locked, and he would be deprived of a congregation except for the poorer section of his parishioners who sat on the open benches at the back of the church.

Efforts were made to meet this state of things early in the century. Certain of the laity got together and wrote a letter to Howley, who was then Bishop of London, pointing out how far the Church accommodation in many districts of London and Middlesex lagged behind the needs of the population. The following year, the year of Waterloo, they wrote to the Prime Minister, Lord Liverpool, pointing out the same facts. The Government were very ready to assist, but the country was groaning under a terrible burden of taxation owing to the war and nothing could be done at the moment.

However in 1818 the Church Building Society was founded.

The interest aroused was general, and considerable donations were made by the King, the bishops and chapters, the universities and the City companies. The subject of Church building had even formed a part of the Prince Regent's speech from the throne in January of that year. As a result of this speech a Church Building Act was passed ordering a grant of a million pounds for the purpose of building churches and chapels in crowded centres. Another half million was voted for the same purpose in 1824. This Act of the Government encouraged private generosity. Cornish says that between 1818 and 1833 at least six million pounds were spent on Church building. There were of course criticisms. It was said that it was no good building fresh churches when the old ones were not full. It was said also that some of the buildings were of too grandiose a character. S. Pancras, S. Marylebone, and S. Luke, Chelsea, were the special targets of criticism because they each cost anything up to £28,000. In spite of the criticisms, there was general relief over the work done, not only in London but also throughout the country.

Useful as it was, however, it did not go far enough. When Blomfield took the reins in London he found that he had to augment very considerably what had been done already within the area of the diocese. He set to work to make an appeal for the building of fifty new churches. That was in 1836, the year when the Ecclesiastical Commission became active. The idea was ridiculed in some quarters, but the appeal met with amazing success. Within ten years, forty-four churches were completed, ten were in course of erection, and nine others were about to begin. The bishop himself set an example of generosity. S. Stephen, Hammersmith, was built and endowed entirely at his own expense. Pusey had to cut down his own style of living because he sent £5,000 to the fund. In addition to private benefactions, Blomfield got a certain amount of help from the special Commission which had been set up to administer the Government grants.⁵

VI

One sphere in which no great advance could be recorded at this time was that of Church government. As has already

⁵ Carpenter, *op. cit.*, p. 105.

been mentioned, the Convocations were silent during the whole of this period. At least, however, steps were taken to end the scandal. But we must not assume that the nation as a whole regarded itself as blameworthy in this respect. Repeated quarrels between the Upper and Lower Houses had gone far to destroy the prestige of Convocation. Few therefore can have been sorry when in 1717, from fear that the Lower House would formally censure the notorious Bishop Hoadly, the Whig Government had unconstitutionally insisted on a prorogation. After that Convocation had been formally summoned at the opening of each Parliament but had been given no Letters of Business. However with the rise of reform in the early nineteenth century it became clear that the clergy ought to have some means of coming to a common mind and expressing their opinion. A Society for the Revival of Convocation gathered such strength that in 1852, after a silence of 135 years, the Canterbury Convocation was allowed the full exercise of its functions. The opposition of the Archbishop of York delayed a similar revival of the Northern Convocation, but after a change in the primatial see the province of York followed the example of its southern neighbour. Its Convocation began to transact business in 1861.

No doubt it was this absence of an effective clerical assembly that had been partly responsible for the stagnation of Church affairs. But it was less serious than it might have been, because Parliament could still find some time to give to ecclesiastical business. This explains why the second reform, like the first, was largely the result of parliamentary action. It did not mean, however, that the Church had no voice in its own affairs. The bishops, of course, sat in the House of Lords, and the House of Commons still represented the laity. At the parochial level also laymen had a chance of making their voice heard, at any rate with regard to the material side of Church affairs; but membership of the vestry was by no means confined to professing and practising Churchmen. On the whole the Church was still regarded as the State in its religious aspect. The sharp delineation of the Church as an entity in its own right did not come about until later in the period through the influence of the Oxford Movement.

Such a state of mind explains why there was no protest against the course taken by the reform of the ecclesiastical courts, in which again Blomfield was closely concerned. He was a member of the Royal Commission set up in 1830 to report on the question. On its advice the old Court of Delegates was abolished in 1832 and final appeals were transferred to the Privy Council. As it was composed of Lords spiritual and temporal the Privy Council was held to be "a most perfect tribunal" for hearing ecclesiastical cases. The following year, however, appeals were transferred from the Council as a whole to its Judicial Committee. This body is composed entirely of lay judges. If bishops are brought in, it can only be as assessors who have no vote and whose duty is solely, like that of other technical experts, to give advice when invited.

In the reform of the lower courts the position of the bishop was more carefully safeguarded. In 1840 the Church Discipline Act was passed, enabling the bishop on receipt of a complaint to issue a commission of inquiry into the conduct of a clergyman and to impose a penalty by agreement. Appeal was allowed to the Provincial Court or, if the case had first been heard there, to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Even those who supported this Act on the precise ground that it recognized the bishop as the source of jurisdiction seem to have voiced no complaint against the possibility of appeal to the Judicial Committee, in which the ultimate decision rested in the hands of laymen. Later generations, however, were quick to detect incompetence in the lay judges' handling of theological questions, and the result has been a general unwillingness to accept the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council as a final court of appeal.

On the more purely administrative side of Church affairs the bishop was still at this period his own executive officer. He had no suffragans to help him and he had no diocesan secretary with a staff of clerks. He had a legal secretary of course, but the work of the present-day diocesan office was done in his own palace. His main support came from the archdeacons, who were responsible for the care not only of buildings but also of the clergy. In view of the large area they had to cover their work could not be very thoroughly

done. The one really effective reform in this respect was to put an intermediate officer in charge of a smaller area in which he could know each clergyman individually. This was done by reviving and making effective the ancient office of rural dean.

This office had fallen into desuetude. Attempts to revive it after the original Reformation had been thwarted because they had been rightly diagnosed as steps by which the Puritans hoped to introduce the Presbyterian *classis*. Later there had been spasmodic efforts at revival. In some instances the ancient deanery had survived as an honorary title. Now, however, there was widespread recognition that such an office was just what was needed. Blomfield had recognized how valuable it might have been to him when he was Archdeacon of Colchester. As Bishop of London he began to appoint rural deans in 1844. Other bishops were doing the same thing and the movement owed much to the zeal of Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford. Every one knows how admirably the rural deans have since justified their existence.

CHAPTER II

LIFE

ORGANIZATION, whether financial or administrative, is merely the husk which protects the kernel of the Church's life. That living kernel is to be found in three sections : education, evangelization and worship. We shall consider each of these in turn, and we shall find that in respect of all three there was a very marked degree of both reform and advance during the first half of the nineteenth century.

I

In no section of the Church's life was there so great progress as in that of education. In England the Church had been wholly responsible for this public service during the medieval period. After that teachers in the universities and the grammar schools still continued to be drawn from the ranks of the clergy. It was only in the elementary grade that during the eighteenth century private schools began to appear. The Church still strove to keep pace with the growth of population. The S.P.C.K. played an honourable part in the foundation of charity schools in the large towns. By 1718 there were nearly 1,400 such schools. The curriculum was very simple—the three R's for the boys, while sewing and knitting took the place of arithmetic for the girls. Everything was based, of course, upon religion as practised in the Church of England.

In spite of such efforts there was an increasing number of very poor children who had no schooling at all. To meet this need Robert Raikes started Sunday Schools and in them gave secular as well as religious instruction. He banded these institutions together in 1803 in the Sunday School Union. By 1834 they catered for a million and a half children.

The difficulty in the way of starting day schools for the poor was the scarcity of teachers combined with the inability to pay them when found. This difficulty was overcome by

the development of the monitorial system, in which the more advanced pupils taught the less advanced. The merit of such courageous experiment is shared between Lancaster, a Quaker, and Bell, an army chaplain. The two differed in their approach to the teaching of religion. Lancaster was content with a vague undenominationalism, while Bell insisted on definite Church teaching. The difference led to the foundation of two societies, the National Society on behalf of the Church of England in 1811, and, for the rest, the British and Foreign School Society, which succeeded an earlier Lancastrian Society in 1814. The Church easily maintained its pride of service. In 1831 while there were less than 500 "British" schools the National Society had over 3,000. It was not until the following year that Parliament began to give grants for school building.

The person who was probably more responsible than any other single individual for the whole movement was Joshua Watson, a wine merchant on Tower Hill. He was a member of the old-fashioned High Church party and was wholly devoted to the interests of the Church. He gave all his leisure to its work; and in 1814, when he was only 43, retired from business in order that he might spend the whole of his time on its tasks. He went to live at Clapton near his only brother, the Rector of Hackney, and there with a few like-minded friends constituted the group known as the "Clapton Sect" or the "Hackney Phalanx." This body was behind most of the reforming efforts of the time, at least when those efforts did not seem to compromise strict Church principles. Watson himself would not support the Ecclesiastical Commissioners because they seemed to be laying violent hands on Church property. Nor would he countenance any weakening of religious teaching. When the Bishop of Norwich suggested that they would get more money for Church schools if they left the teaching of the catechism optional, he retorted: "You must bid much higher, if you expect us to sell the Church Catechism." He was one of the three founders of the National Society, and remained its treasurer for 35 years. He was also one of the originators of the Church Building Society. And he was also responsible for the inauguration of the Additional Curates Society, becoming its first treasurer.

Although he was a strong "Church and State" man and was sometimes accused of overemphasizing the importance of the Establishment, he could not bear the interference of the State in ecclesiastical affairs. He actually resigned the treasurership of the National Society rather than accept the £5,000 offered by the Government to S. Mark's College, Chelsea. He was a close friend of both Archbishop Howley and of Bishop Blomfield. He was a little afraid of the new form of High Churchmanship developed by the Tractarians, but he recognized that, as Pusey said, they were "carrying on the same torch," and he was honoured by Newman's dedication to him of the fifth volume of the "Parochial and Plain Sermons." He was permitted a long life in which to continue his services to the Church he loved so well. He died in 1853 at the age of 84.

Watson and his friends of the National Society and Lancaster with the founders of the British Schools were not the only section of the public interested in education. It was the great age of the Utilitarians led by Jeremy Bentham and James Mill. They too were anxious for the spread of knowledge among the poor. They preferred the British Schools to the National because in them the religion was of a vague type, but they did not really think that religion was necessary to education at all. They held that scientific knowledge was in itself sufficient for the release of the human spirit. Together with Brougham, the Lord Chancellor, they founded a Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, and published penny magazines and encyclopædias. They had little effect on the course of elementary education, but were more successful at the university level.

Oxford and Cambridge were still monopolies of the Church of England. In these homes of learning insistence on religious tests still prevailed. This pressed hard upon the Dissenters, who had to go to Scotland or the Continent for academic degrees. The university tests still persisted even after the abolition of the Test and Corporation Acts in 1828 and the removal of Roman Catholic disabilities the following year. To provide some alternative to the ancient universities a movement was set on foot to found a non-sectarian, or as we should now call it, an undenominational university, in

London. A number of churchmen supported the Utilitarians and Dissenters in this effort. As a result land was bought in Gower Street, and a building was erected and opened under the title of the "University of London" in 1828. It had, however, no power of granting degrees. It suffered from the further disability that its "modern" curriculum roused the wrath of the classicists. Also its vagueness on the religious side presently occasioned misgivings among churchmen. The latter therefore set to work and raised funds for a Church of England college, which was duly founded and incorporated under the title of King's College in 1829. Later, in 1836, when a charter was granted to the University of London, King's College was named together with University College and others as institutions whose students could be presented for degrees. A true university was thus set going.

In the meantime the Dean and Chapter of Durham, realizing that the progress of reform would probably mean that raids would shortly be made upon the revenues of their cathedral, determined to anticipate events. No doubt they were also moved by a genuine enthusiasm for higher education. In any case they devoted large sums to the foundation of Durham University, which received its charter in 1832. This meant that in this period of reform the Church had established two institutions of higher learning to take a place side by side with the ancient university colleges.

The training of the clergy was a specialized sphere of education in which another notable reform was effected during this period. Hitherto it had been expected that candidates for the ministry would pursue their studies at the universities. It began to be realized, however, that for a priest to be "an educated gentleman" was not enough. Technical knowledge had also to be acquired and practised. Bishop Burnet of Salisbury, who had a poor opinion of the manners of university undergraduates, tried towards the end of the seventeenth century the experiment of a diocesan college in which ten men were put under the tuition of a local rector. That however had fallen through owing to the opposition of Oxford. Another experiment was that of Wilson, the famous Bishop of Sodor and Man, who had taken ordination candidates to live with him and receive the benefit

of his personal instruction. The first attempt at clerical education to achieve permanent success was a cross between a university and a seminary. This was S. David's College, Lampeter. The original fund for this foundation was subscribed by the clergy of the diocese who, poor though they were, contributed a tithe of their benefice income. The fund was started in 1804, but, nobly as it was supported, it was not nearly enough. Public interest, however, was aroused : a site was offered at Lampeter ; George IV gave £1,000, Oxford and Cambridge £200 each. The College was opened in 1827, and by later charters was allowed to confer B.D. and B.A. degrees.

Before Lampeter finally got under way a theological college pure and simple, for candidates who were unable to receive a university training, was started by Bishop Law of Chester in 1816. St. Bees had a great success, and before the end of the half century it had as many as 120 students in residence. The same bishop had the honour of founding a rather different kind of seminary when he was translated to Bath and Wells. In 1840 he opened the Wells Theological College, an institution which did not profess to provide a substitute for university education, but a complement to it. Entrants to Wells are still normally expected already to have obtained their university degree. They can then give themselves wholly to the specialized studies for the ministry. For the north S. Aidan's College, Birkenhead, was founded on similar lines in 1846. In 1848 the special needs of men preparing for work overseas received attention. By Royal Charter S. Augustine's College, Canterbury, was founded on the site of the ancient abbey of S. Augustine's for the training of future missionaries.

All this represented an epoch-making reform in the technical training of the clergy. The movement then begun proceeded at an accelerating pace. Cuddesdon, Lichfield, Salisbury, Warminster, Highbury and Lincoln soon followed, together with a number of other clerical colleges founded still later in the century. As a result it may safely be asserted that never in the history of the Church of England have the clergy been so well trained, at least on the technical side of their work, as they are at the present time.

II

Evangelization, the proclamation of the Gospel to those who have not heard it, is the primary duty of the Christian Church. It is generally considered under the two heads of home and foreign missions. In both spheres there was room for much improvement at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

At home a large population was growing up and congregating in the towns. It was almost as ignorant of the Christian religion as the confessedly heathen peoples overseas. Here was a tremendous field for evangelism. But how was it to be done? Church buildings and schools, as we have seen, were as yet hopelessly inadequate. That meant that even if the masses could be persuaded to come to church and space could be found for them, they would still be ignorant of the customary forms of worship and unable to follow them on any printed form. What aids to the reception of the Gospel could one provide in such conditions?

The Methodists had done it by preaching. When people had been converted in the open air they were invited into cheaply constructed chapels where there was a warmth and intimacy that did not exist in the parish churches, and where the chief part of the service was the sermon. The Church was handicapped both by its more cumbersome organization and by its prejudice against "enthusiasm," which was regarded with as much horror as is Bolshevism at the present day. Great faith was placed in the multiplication of schools and in the religious instruction given there. But that was a long-term policy. Something of more immediate effect was needed.

An example had been set by the Religious Tract Society, founded on an undenominational basis the year before the new century opened. Its publications were well calculated to appeal to the contemporary multitude. They were cheap, entertaining and definitely improving. They were easy to understand and were often read to a circle of illiterates by some friend who had had sufficient schooling. They were designed to appeal to all ages and the young were not neglected. Many of us can still remember how our early years were brightened by the *Boys' Own Paper*.

On the distinctively Church side the most able exponent of this technique was Hannah More. She was not afraid to enlist the methods of the novel and the drama in the interests of religion. The daughter of a grammar-school master near Bristol, she had become a well-known ornament of society in London. She had mixed with the intelligentsia of the day, and was a close friend of both Johnson and Garrick, whose deaths moved her deeply. When her thoughts turned more exclusively to serious things she found another friend in Beilby Porteus, Bishop of London, who encouraged her in her design of writing for the poor. The success of a small volume on *Village Politics*, designed to counteract possible revolutionary tendencies, started her on a long series of "Cheap Repository Tracts" which had a mainly religious interest. One of her most successful books was *Coelebs in Search of a Wife*, a satire on the manners of the idle rich, which ran into thirty editions during its author's life. Hannah More's time was not solely devoted to literary exercises. She was a champion of the cause of day and Sunday schools, maintaining her own schools in the Vale of Cheddar and effecting thereby a moral reformation in that section of rural society. It may seem strange to us that although she gave her life to the relief of the poor, she never questioned the morality of a social system which produced and maintained extremes of poverty and wealth.

Another method by which the work of evangelization was promoted was the formation of societies for the support of special sides of the work. What the Church as a whole could not do on account of its size and stiff organization could be done and done effectively by an *ad hoc* society of real enthusiasts. This became a regular device for inaugurating new work or resuscitating work that had threatened to become moribund. A number of the societies that are best known to-day had their first beginning at this time. Obviously one of the most necessary means for the carrying on of evangelistic endeavours was a sufficient supply of human agents. Two societies were founded to help produce and provide for the men required. To meet the increase in town population by furnishing more ministerial assistance the Church Pastoral Aid Society was inaugurated in 1836. This

was an enterprise of the Evangelicals instigated by Robert Seeley the publisher. It set itself to provide lay assistants as well as ordained. This aroused misgivings on the part of some who remembered too well the precedent of lay preachers set by the Methodists. They therefore broke away, and in the following year founded the Additional Curates' Society for the provision of ordained men only. This, as we have seen, had the support of the redoubtable Joshua Watson. Both societies have continued to flourish and have materially assisted the work of evangelization down to our own day.

A Society that was intended to assist the work of evangelization both at home and abroad was the British and Foreign Bible Society. Hitherto S.P.C.K. had been the chief agency for distributing the Scriptures to civilians, and there had been a special society for supplying Bibles to the army and navy. The work had to be done so cheaply that it offered no attraction to ordinary publishers. Consequently the supply had fallen far short of the demand. There was a very great need of Bibles, particularly in Wales. A meeting of the Religious Tract Society was much moved by the story of a Welsh girl who, having saved up enough money to buy a Bible, walked 30 miles over the hills only to find that there was not a copy to be had. It was soon resolved to start a special society to print Bibles for Wales, and "if for Wales, why not for the British Empire and the world?" The result was the foundation in 1804 of the British and Foreign Bible Society. The text was to be that of the Authorized Version without note or comment. Beilby Porteous accepted this plan. Churchmen and Nonconformists supported it with singular unanimity, the Wesleyans even going so far as to say that they considered themselves sufficiently represented on the committee by the bishops. The only sectarian difficulty arose over the admission to the committee of Unitarians, which led a certain number to secede and form a Trinitarian Bible Society. A different kind of difficulty arose over the Apocrypha, and then the Society showed itself less liberal. Indeed the complaint is still made that its Bible is incomplete, inasmuch as even now it is not allowed to contain the books of the Apocrypha. The main work of Bible printing and translation has ever since been done by the original Bible

Society, which has proved itself an indispensable handmaid of the Church as well as of other religious bodies both at home and overseas.

A society whose work may be considered a half-way house between home and foreign evangelism was the London Society for promoting Christianity among the Jews, founded in 1809.

It is when we come to the societies engaged exclusively on overseas work that we reach the peak of our story. The nineteenth century was the greatest century of Christian expansion, greater even than the Apostolic Age. When the century opened, the overseas work of the Church of England was still almost entirely under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of London. The whole of it had been put in his hands as long ago as 1634 by a Charter of Charles I. The only exceptions even at this time were Nova Scotia and Quebec, whose separate bishoprics had been founded late in the eighteenth century. But from the time of the new reform advance was rapid. We had learnt our lesson in the United States, where the unwillingness of the English Government to countenance the appointment of bishops had nearly wrecked the Church. The idea of an episcopal church without bishops was seen to be ridiculous, and steps were taken to ensure episcopal ministrations as early as possible in the history of any new mission station. Between 1814 and 1840 eight new bishoprics were founded in the colonies. As far as Canada was concerned the two started there were largely due to the exertions of the Newfoundland Society (founded in 1823). In 1841 this was merged into the Colonial and Continental Church Society which still continues with us. That year saw an inauguration which had even greater immediate importance. Bishop Blomfield of London had been chidden by a clergyman in the far west of what we now know as Canada for neglecting that part of his diocese. He took the complaint to heart, however preposterous it might seem, and set about founding the Colonial Bishoprics Fund in 1841. It attracted considerable contributions and before the half century was reached fourteen colonial bishoprics had been founded, in addition to the ten already in existence.¹

¹ Cnatttingius, *Bishops and Societies*, p. 204.

Behind the activities of these newly-created societies lay the sympathy and support of the older societies S.P.C.K. and S.P.G. They had now been functioning for a century and the benefit of their experience was available for the new ventures. But they were sedate and respectable, averse to any "enthusiasm" and incapable of stirring up the driving energy necessary to meet the new opportunities. Above all they were quite outside the influence of the Evangelical Revival. When it was realized how important it was to harness that influence to the missionary cause it was quite inevitable that a new society should be formed for the purpose. Under the inspiration of Charles Simeon and John Venn, the Church Missionary Society (though under a slightly different name) was inaugurated in 1799. This has proved itself to be the greatest of the Anglican missionary societies, at least so far as the extent of its work is concerned, and it was an important element in the new reform of the Church. It was slow in making a start. At first through the failure of Englishmen to respond to the call overseas it was compelled, as S.P.C.K. had been before it, to use the service of Lutheran missionaries. It had perhaps greater excuse than the older society, for it was founded "on the Church principle, not the High Church principle." Nevertheless it is interesting to notice that its Lutheran officers, when they were on furlough in this country, were asked not to preach in dissenting chapels. Naturally, perhaps, in such circumstances it did not easily gain episcopal recognition; but it was proud of its independence and threw itself upon the charity of those whom it could persuade of the paramount obligation of missionary work. It educated its public by forming associations in the parishes. From them it expected the accumulation of regular contributions. It also sent round "deputations" in the shape of preachers who were willing to speak as advocates for its cause. It thus became responsible, over and above its work in the foreign field, for two methods of Church work which have since become part and parcel of our parochial organization, the parish missionary association and the deputation preacher. It would be beside our purpose to follow the fortunes of the C.M.S. in its efforts overseas. Our attention is concentrated upon the Home Church. But

it would be almost impossible to exaggerate the influence of this and the other societies upon the progress of Church reform in this country.

III

If the chief end of man is to glorify God, it is evident that in no sphere will the characteristic life of a church be more clearly reflected than in its worship. But to judge an age by this standard is not altogether easy. Statistics are not of great service even if they are available. For the rest there is no fixed standard of the desirable or of the attainable, and the evidence is by no means uniform. Of these difficulties the pre-nineteenth century church is a conspicuous example. The trouble has been increased by the tendentious judgment of partisan historians. It was perhaps natural that while those who wished to throw into strong relief the changes effected in the first half of the nineteenth century have unconsciously darkened the background of the immediately preceding period, those who thought but poorly of those changes should have ignored or forgotten the abuses of the preceding age. The uncertainty in which the unbiassed historian is left is well illustrated by a paragraph in Warre Cornish's first volume on the *History of the English Church in the Nineteenth Century*:

“Elderly men can remember the end of these times, when one part of England was remote from another, when abuses were tolerated because they were not published, and those who profited by them were more envied than blamed; when duties sat light on incumbents, and clergymen were sportsmen and played cards for money; when daily services and weekly communions were unknown, and no one thought of “restoring” the churches; and they can remember also that with all this neglect of observances there was much quiet attention to simple parochial duty, good preaching and sound learning amongst the clergy. . . . Had there not been many such clergymen, the Church must have been abolished, not reformed.”²

Happily the recovery of several clerical diaries, belonging to the earlier period either in time or spirit, has served to

² p. 103.

emphasize the side of truth so well brought out in the concluding section of the above quotation. It is evident that, whatever may have been the state of the official hierarchy, or even of the clergy as a whole, the work in at least some of the parishes was maintained at a high level. A judicious and monumental work by Wickham Legg³ has reviewed the available evidence and has shown that if the lamp of devotion did not burn brightly before the reform it was at least kept alight. It did not need to be rekindled so much as to be fanned into fresh and living flame.⁴

Before descending to details two general remarks may be worth making. First, a certain low level in liturgical practice and church maintenance was deliberately encouraged from fear and dislike of Rome. By the English mind of the day Roman Catholicism was still interpreted in the light of many stories of treachery and cruelty. Plots against the Crown and atrocities on the part of the continental Inquisition were associated by every schoolboy with the history of the Roman Catholic Church. It was therefore natural that it should seem the part of patriotism to distinguish the national religion as sharply as possible from everything that seemed to savour of Rome. Second, paradoxical as it may seem, the general standard of religion was very much the same everywhere in the eighteenth century. The nations do not live in such watertight compartments as we sometimes imagine. Worldliness, secularism, apathy, spiritual laziness were very much part of the character of the age. Few things startle the student more upon first becoming acquainted with continental Church history than to find in the contemporary Church of France abuses which he had thought to be solely

³ *English Church Life from the Restoration to the Tractarian Movement.*

⁴ What we are concerned to do here is to show that there were during the half century of our period great and effective changes. Testimony to the truth of this view has recently come from an unexpected quarter. The chairman of the Modern Churchmen's Union in his address to the annual conference has drawn attention to the alleged deterioration of the "status and prestige" of the Church of England since 1851. Now no one doubts that in 1800 the position was much worse than it is to-day. If then 1851 represents a sort of high-water mark the improvement must have been due to the character of what we have ventured to call the Second Reform.

characteristic of the eighteenth century Church of England. These reflections help us to understand, even if they do not excuse, the condition of affairs in this country.

The faithful made their communion far less frequently than they do to-day. In this respect conditions had deteriorated towards the end of the eighteenth century. At its beginning there were not a few churches where there was a weekly celebration, and a considerable proportion of Church people were accustomed to make their communion every month. It was Queen Anne's habit to communicate monthly. Wesley's circle at Oxford, which of course was especially pious, had a rule of weekly communion. Later however there was a steady decline. About the middle of the eighteenth century the Bishop of Chester complained in a visitation charge that the weekly communion was "a great and grievous innovation, and an heavy charge upon the parishioners." In such circumstances it is hardly strange that other bishops had to take special care that incumbents should enable their parishioners to fulfil the Prayer Book obligation of communion at least three times a year. Perhaps one of the reasons why reform was somewhat slow in this respect was that frequent communion was associated with Evangelical "enthusiasm." Whitefield said that at Lady Huntingdon's they had "the sacrament every morning, heavenly consolation all day, and preaching at night," and John Wesley recorded that during the Twelve Days of Christmass 1774 they "had the Lord's Supper daily." This was in accordance with what they took to be the primitive practice of daily celebration. No doubt the fact is thus explained that so large a part in the reform of Church services was due to the Evangelicals, a part which is not often credited to them and which they themselves have too often forgotten.

The idea of keeping churches shut from Sunday to Sunday was by no means indigenous to Evangelicalism. Thus Daniel Wilson introduced at Islington both Saint's Day services, and also Litany on Wednesdays and Fridays. He also established the practice of early celebrations of the Holy Communion. The Tractarians' devotion to the sacraments was sufficient to overcome any suspicion they may have entertained of a practice introduced by their rivals. They accepted the lead

and went much further. They not only had their early communions but also contrived that the Eucharist should be obviously shown to be, what in any case it inevitably was, the chief service of the day. This meant that it should be celebrated at the mid-morning hour when most people went to church, and should be accompanied by all the most splendid adjuncts that art and music could supply. The Eucharist was sung at the consecration of Leeds parish church in 1841 and a weekly Sung Eucharist was soon to be held at All Saints, Margaret Street.⁵ This was probably the most revolutionary change in the conduct of services that occurred in the course of the Second Reform.

It was longer before the quality of the music was improved, although the demand for music at the Eucharist opened a fresh field for English composers. The organ replaced the old tranters or orchestral players in the parish churches, just as in the twentieth century it replaced the orchestra in the cinemas. Under Tractarian influence the choir was brought down from the gallery to the chancel and robed in surplices. This created a little interest at the eastern end of the church before it was found to compete with the colour and movement of the Sung Eucharist. Psalms and canticles were sung to Anglican chants in the larger churches, and were made so stiff and unnatural that they had to be left mostly to the choir. The ancient Plainsong was restored in some churches as a result of the Oxford Movement but never recaptured its old popularity. The anthem gave the richest opportunity to composer and choir alike. It developed to such a length as to distort the proportions of the service. The standard of cathedral music was saved from complete deterioration by the Three Choirs' Festival, which began about 1717, by the work of Boyce and Arnold in the same century, and by that of Attwood, Walmisley, Dykes and Samuel Sebastian Wesley in the nineteenth.

The most important reform in church music was the introduction of hymn-singing. This again was due to the Evangelicals. It had been an influential element in the work of the Wesleys. They had followed the lead of the Non-conformist, Isaac Watts, and braved the Puritan dislike of

⁵ W. Douglas, *Church Music in History and Practice*, p. 86.

non-scriptural verses which had confined congregational singing to metrical psalms. The Methodists gained greatly from the epoch-making efforts of the Wesleys. William Law said that "for one who has been drawn away from the Established Church by Preaching, ten have been induced by Music." The Church was denied the benefit of such community singing until the Charity Schools revealed its possibilities and congregations began to imitate them. John Newton and William Cowper produced the Olney Hymns in 1779, and Heber adapted hymns of his own and other compositions "to the weekly church service of the year" (published by his widow in 1826), and thus set the pattern for future hymn-books. The Oxford Movement made its contribution when Dr. Neale published the *Hymnal Noted* in 1852 with many translations of hymns from the ancient offices. This led the way to *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, first published in 1861.

One way of testing the position in regard to worship is to consider the regularity with which the daily offices were publicly said. The Book of Common Prayer explicitly orders the parochial clergy to say Morning and Evening Prayer in the churches for which they are responsible and it expects members of the laity to frequent the daily services when they conveniently can. It is significant that this habit was strongly maintained during at any rate a considerable part of the eighteenth century. Indeed in a number of places it continued almost to the end of that century. George III, when at Windsor, regularly went to morning prayers in the King's Chapel with his family at 8 o'clock, and walked home to breakfast with them afterwards. Fortunately we are not left to haphazard information as to custom elsewhere. Wickham Legg⁶ reproduces tables giving the times at which services were held in the City of London and the Westminster churches between 1692 and 1824. In practically all of them at the earlier date there were two services a day and at some of them there were three. Sometimes morning prayers were duplicated and then the earlier hour would be 6 or 7. The hour for evening prayer varied from 3 to 8. This was maintained till the middle of the eighteenth century, but then there began signs of a slight falling off. This must have

⁶ *English Church Life*, pp. 108-111.

developed through the latter part of the century because by 1824, except in one or two places such as S. Martin-in-the-Fields, and S. Andrew's, Holborn, the custom had either died out altogether or had been reduced to one service a day. Even of the latter custom there are only four instances. In all there were only nine parish churches in the cities of London and Westminster by 1824 which had a daily service. This state of things appears to have been paralleled throughout the country. Consequently when the Tractarians began to re-introduce the public recitation of the daily office their action was regarded as quite un-English and an imitation of Rome. Of course the fact was that they were merely restoring a practice definitely ordered by the Prayer Book and regularly practised until a couple of generations before.

Nevertheless the change, when it came, represented something like a revolution in the life of the clergy. They were recalled to the duty of saying their office, and this was for many the staple of their prayers. Similarly it meant a great, if gentler, change in the habits of a number of ladies who had the opportunity of joining daily in the ordered worship of the Church. Practically every parish could muster a few to share with the minister the quiet devotion of mattins, litany and evensong. These few acted as a nucleus conserving strength and vitality for the parish as a whole. Far more spectacular was the revolution in the spheres of education and evangelization which we have already discussed. But it is probable that the daily prayers of the few gathered around the parish altar did much to maintain the creative energy of those who were working in the more exciting fields. Together they made the first half of the nineteenth century the most fruitful period the Church had enjoyed for three hundred years.

CHAPTER III

SPIRIT (LIBERALS AND EVANGELICALS)

IF reform in organization is a sign and consequence of reviving life, life itself is dependent upon spirit. To put the same truth in another way: men's actions will ultimately depend upon their thoughts. In the last two chapters we have been considering externals, in the remaining two we must think of ideas. In the present we think of the Liberals and Evangelicals, and first of the Liberals.

I

It must be constantly remembered that reform was in the air; it was part of the atmosphere men breathed. The foundation of the American republic and the revolution in France had set all intelligent people thinking over the inherent and constitutional rights of man. Further, the war with France had pressed very hard upon English economic conditions. The Industrial Revolution, together with the growth in population, increased the intensity of dissatisfaction. The Reform Bill was at last passed in 1832, but so far from bringing peace and content it provided a more efficient platform for complaint. The condition of the poor remained all but intolerable. Within twelve years of the passing of the Bill Engels was writing his examination into the "Condition of the Working Class in England," and four years later Karl Marx joined with him in the publication of the Communist Manifesto. The Chartist Movement covered the years 1836 to 1848.

The Church incurred a good deal of odium, as far as the working classes were concerned, because it was not in favour of these manifestations of a desire for fundamental change. It was content to do a great deal to relieve distress and to improve opportunities for education, but not until the middle of the century were any of the leading clergy prepared to join in assailing the political system under which extremes of

poverty and wealth had been tolerated if not actively encouraged. It is often contended, sometimes with approval and sometimes with regret, that religion acts as a conservative element in the community. In the political sphere this was certainly true at this period. The bishops as a body were concerned to oppose reform, Blomfield of London being the sole original supporter of the Reform Bill. In the ecclesiastical sphere they were more conscious of the need of reform, and some of them, as we have seen, had taken a leading part in the movements we have already outlined.

The general unsettlement had not only led to demand for practical reforms in the Church parallel to those effected in the State. It had extended the area of questioning into more fundamental regions than merely practical issues. Just as the political philosophers were led by recent events to examine the very foundations of the common life, so there were not wanting ecclesiastics who were prepared to display the same spirit of enquiry in their own spiritual department. They belonged to a school of thought which was known as Liberal. They stood somewhere between the earlier Latitudinarians and the later Modernists. They were not carefully organized like the Evangelicals. Rather they preserved a characteristic independence and they produced individual teachers of real importance.

This Liberalism was not unorthodox in its conclusions, but it was essentially intellectual. It took nothing for granted, but revelled in a spirit of enquiry. Its natural home was a university. In point of fact it was an Oxford college, Oriel, which fathered it. The Oriel Common Room was famous for the ability of its fellows. They had won their position by open examination and consequently represented the cream of academic life. A nickname, that of Noetics or "Intellectuals" was bestowed upon them to describe their fondness for logic and their general attitude of academic superiority. How far they were subject to such outside influences as were represented by Mill or Carlyle may be doubted—Oxford groups generally like to think of themselves as self-contained—but they certainly felt the breeze of German Biblical criticism. Pusey himself, who belonged to Oriel, was well-versed in German theology, and Thomas Davison, another of

the number, was the first English writer to approach the Hebrew prophets from the side of the Higher Criticism. The two Provosts of the period were Coplestone, who in 1828 became Bishop of Llandaff, and Hawkins, who later became the antagonist of the Tractarians. Another member of the Oriel Common Room was Whately, the future Archbishop of Dublin, who was elected Fellow at the same time as Keble. He was a thinker of cold but brilliant intellect whose best known work was fittingly the *Elements of Logic*. He was much influenced by another member, Blanco White, a person of Spanish extraction, an ex-Romanist on the way to extreme Liberalism. Whately himself had a great influence on Newman, teaching him for the first time to think of the Church as a separate and self-contained unit, but later he moved further in the Liberal direction as Newman moved in the Catholic.

Perhaps the most famous of the Oxford Liberals was Thomas Arnold. After a brilliant undergraduate career he was elected Fellow of Oriel in the year of Waterloo and was made deacon three years later. Difficulties about subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles kept him from priests' orders for ten years. Then, having overcome his scruples, he entered upon his great work as Headmaster of Rugby. His career there has been immortalized in *Tom Brown's Schooldays*. It is sufficient to say of it that it fulfilled Hawkins' prophecy that he would revolutionize Public School education in this country. He acted as his own chaplain, and strove to make his school a truly religious institution based on the ideal of the "Christian gentleman." He shook off his Unitarian tendencies (which he bequeathed to his son Matthew the poet and historian); but in spite of his essential orthodoxy he could never stomach the idea of a priestly church. He put out indeed a scheme for identifying the church with the nation and including in it all Christians but Roman Catholics, Quakers and Unitarians. Of the contemporary church he had the poorest opinion. "The Church, as it now stands, no human power can save." Nevertheless some of his ideas for reform were salutary and effective. He wished to purge episcopacy of its more prelatical associations. "A bishop should be incapable of acting without his council, and his

council should consist partly of lay members, and partly of clerical." For a Public School master he was surprisingly ready to recognize the weaknesses of the current social order and the need of the Church to play its part in remedying civic abuses.

"I cannot understand what is the good of a National Church if it be not to Christianize the nation, and introduce the principles of Christianity into men's social and civil relations, and expose the wickedness of that spirit which maintains the game laws, and in agriculture and trade seems to think that there is no such sin as covetousness, and that if a man is not dishonest, he has nothing to do but make all the profit of his capital that he can."¹

Two famous Oxford Liberals who did not belong to the Oriel group were Milman and Jowett. The former went up from Eton to Brasenose with a reputation as a poet and won a number of prizes. Soon after taking his degree he published a tragedy, *Fazio*, which was promptly pirated and produced at Covent Garden without his permission. He became a fellow of his college in 1814 and later Professor of Poetry. He made his reputation as a historian. In his *History of the Jews* (1829) he introduced the natural method of historical description into the sacred narrative and horrified many besides Gladstone. To others, however, he opened a new world. "Dean Milman," said George Adam Smith in later years, "called Abraham an Arab sheik, and the British Public thought it knew its Bible." The date of his even more famous *History of Latin Christianity* falls outside our period. Just before that period closes, in 1849, he was made Dean of S. Paul's, where he instituted a great reform in the shape of popular Sunday evening services.

The influence of Benjamin Jowett, the redoubtable Master of Balliol, hardly belongs to our period. But he was already active within it. He was a devout disciple and translator of Plato, and there were those who thought that he mistook the teaching of the Greek philosopher for that of Christ. He had a considerable effect in moulding both the thought and the career of his pupils, but his chief work lay in the encourage-

¹ Quoted by Carpenter, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

ment of University reform and particularly in the throwing open of the academic life to Nonconformists.

Another group whose influence belongs to the later part of our period was that of the Christian Socialists, especially Maurice, Kingsley and Hughes. They represent a kind of half-way house between Liberals and Tractarians, but their reforming energies were exercised mostly in the field of social welfare. Their appearance is noted in an interesting passage from G. M. Young.²

"In the 'forties we are aware of a new type issuing from the Universities and public schools, somewhat arrogant and somewhat shy, very conscious of their standing as gentlemen, but very conscious of their duties, too, men in tweeds who smoke in the streets, disciples of Maurice, willing hearers of Carlyle, passionate for drains and co-operative societies, disposed to bring everything in the state of England to the test of Isaiah and Thucydides, and to find the course of all its defects in what, with youthful violence, they would call the disgusting vice of shopkeeping. These are the Arnoldians."

The juxtaposition of the names of Arnold and Maurice is interesting. A link between them is Thomas Hughes, the youngest of the group. Barrister, novelist, Member of Parliament for Lambeth, and later county court judge, a product of both Rugby and Oriel, he had plenty of opportunity to imbibe the spirit of the master whose portrait he drew so sympathetically in *Tom Brown's Schooldays*. The support of such a layman was of inestimable value to his two clerical friends, Kingsley and Maurice. The former was the nearer to him in age.

Kingsley had been nurtured in the atmosphere of reform, for he was trained at King's College, London, before he went up to Cambridge. After a period of religious doubt he was ordained in 1842 and came under the influence of Maurice whom he called his "dearest Master." He developed the ideal of "muscular Christianity," and endeavoured to relate his religion to physical well-being both in the individual and in the body politic. But there was far more to him than that.

² Quoted in *The Church & The World*, Hudson & Reckitt, Vol. III, p. 36.

He was not only a devout and faithful parish priest but also a magnificent pamphleteer. Such novels as *Yeast* and *Alton Locke* exposed the extent of social abuses to a far larger public than could be reached by the ordinary methods of propaganda. He identified himself with those for whom he worked, and he was not afraid to call himself a Chartist. As is revealed by another novel, *The Saint's Tragedy*, he had no sympathy with ascetic religion and he never understood the Tractarians. Indeed he appears at his worst in his most regrettable quarrel with Newman.

Maurice, on the other hand, the oldest of the group, had a far better grasp of the essential elements in their theology and may be said to have laid the foundations of a Liberal Catholicism. Frederick Denison Maurice would have been a giant in any age. Like S. Paul and S. Augustine he had a wholeness and all-roundness of view which could never be fitted into the tenets of any one party. He was brought up in Unitarian circles and won his Catholicism the hard way. He acquired the best part of his pastoral experience as chaplain of Guy's Hospital. While there he wrote the greatest of his books, *The Kingdom of Christ*. Its argument is delivered in the shape of "hints to a Quaker concerning the Principles, Conception, and Ordinances of the Catholic Church," and it is one of the finest defences, philosophical and theological, of Anglicanism to be found in the language. Its effect is still with us and is being reviewed in many learned studies at the present time. He was given a professorship at King's College, and spent his spare time in striving to meet the disappointment of the working classes at the comparative failure of the Reform Act to redress their grievances. He felt that political, social and economic reforms were of no value apart from religion. He inaugurated the Christian Social movement and the co-operative movement as well as a number of educational institutions, trying all the time to integrate spiritual, social, moral and physical life under the inspiration of Christ. He aroused, of course, a great deal of opposition. Disaster fell upon him, but he survived it, and through good and evil fortune continued to bear witness to the faith that was in him. We cannot pursue his career beyond the limit of our period. It is sufficient to notice that without founding a

permanent school of thought he probably did as much as any single individual to affect the spirit of Anglicanism during the period of the Second Reform and after.

We may sum up the effect of religious Liberalism by saying that it meant for Churchmen a great widening of horizons. After the essentially static condition of the preceding half-century it set a questioning in men's minds. The ascendancy of the old Whig and Latitudinarian regime was completely destroyed. In the sphere of theology men became more anxious to understand than to take everything for granted. The view was slowly and painfully gaining ground that to question did not necessarily mean to doubt, and that faith was not just blind acquiescence but a glad surrender of the whole personality. True, there were some who seemed to take a perverse pleasure in destroying without building up, and if the field had been left to them the result would have been disastrous indeed. But those whose faith was real pursued their enquiries in confidence that they would one day find the right answers. Nor were they all interested in the same field of enquiry. The Oxford Liberals found an outlet for their energies in educational reform whether of the Public School or of the University. The Oriel Noetics delved to the root of things and found diverse answers, including one which seemed to be the very antithesis of much that they had hitherto held. The Christian Socialists were content to ignore the rising school of Biblical critics and to infuse theology into the changing political philosophy of the day. But all the time the Church was on the march. Reform was not merely in the air; old things were being shaken, and a new order was being established.

II

But what, it may be asked, was happening all this time to the Evangelicals? At the beginning of the century they were the most active element in the Church. This does not mean that they were the controlling element. Far from it. They were still unpopular with the bulk of the nation and of the Church. Their "enthusiasm" was still contrary to the spirit of the times. Their members held as yet no important posts. Of the thirteen clerical members of the original committee of

C.M.S., only four were beneficed. They were even afraid that the bishops would refuse to grant recognition to the society. It must be remembered that the Evangelicals were still suspect from their early association with the Methodists. They did indeed by origin represent one section of Methodism. In the middle of the previous century Wesley and Whitefield had quarrelled on the question of free will and predestination. Wesley had held to the Arminian view while Whitefield had championed the Calvinist teaching. This was an old point of difference in the Church of England, for the old-fashioned High Churchmen who looked back to Laud were Arminians, while the Low Churchmen, in reliance on the Thirty-nine Articles, leaned towards Calvinism. Consequently when the Wesleyans became a separate organization, the Evangelicals remaining with Whitefield in the Church of England retained the Calvinistic colour of his theology. Nevertheless, the two points to which they attached most importance were not predestination or determinism, but the experience of personal conversion and the vicarious atonement accomplished through the death of Christ.

Both these emphases can be clearly seen in the case of Charles Simeon, who was the most conspicuous person to carry the Evangelical movement over to the nineteenth century. He was an Eton boy, a good athlete and a competent horseman. When he went up to King's, Cambridge, he was something of a dandy and seemed likely to follow the usual course of the idle rich. He was, however, brought up all standing by the realization that in college chapel he would be required to make his communion. To prepare himself he read the only religious book he knew, *The Whole Duty of Man*, but it did not make the service bring him any peace. He then discovered Bishop Wilson's *Short and Plain Instruction for the better understanding of the Lord's Supper*, and read there that the Jewish sin-offering typified the Atonement. This for the first time introduced him effectively to the thought that he could transfer his sins to Christ. He determined to bear them on his own soul no longer, and then at the Lord's Table had "the sweetest access to God through my blessed Saviour." From that experience his change of life began. He was ordained and attached as an honorary

curate to S. Edward's where his preaching had an instantaneous success. He was appointed to the incumbency of Holy Trinity, where he met with much opposition from the congregation and from the senior members of the university. Among the undergraduates, however, he ministered with ever-increasing effectiveness. After ten years or so he wore down all opposition and ultimately became the leading religious figure in Cambridge. He maintained his rooms at King's, and in them on Friday evenings he met his friends and disciples in converse severely confined to spiritual things. There he inspired many of them with his own zeal, and enlisted many, such as Henry Martyn, for service in the mission field. Most of his fortune he devoted to good works; and the £5,000 of it that was left at his death went to found the trust for buying advowsons which still bears his name.

It always takes some time before the influence of the universities can spread to the parishes. If during the first generation of their history the Evangelicals had been a small and despised section of enthusiasts, largely identified with the Methodists, even in this second generation roughly contemporary with our period they still remained very much a minority movement. In 1822 there were less than a dozen Evangelical clergy in London, and even by the end of the nineteenth century, when the period of their chief influence had come and gone, they amounted to less than a quarter of the total number of clergy in the country as a whole. The parishes were for the most part closed to them.

They were helped to make headway only by the existence of proprietary chapels. These places of worship had come into existence owing to the need of coping with the increasing population in days when the forming of new parishes was an even more tedious legal process than it is now. Private people were allowed to build a chapel and appoint a minister under licence from the bishop. Later such chapels tended to become commercialized and were something of a scandal, but in the meantime they afforded an outlet for the characteristic Evangelical zeal for preaching. Another opportunity of development was found in the lectureships with which many of the principal town churches were provided. This had been done by the munificence of former benefactors

desiring to provide fuller opportunities for religious instruction than were allowed in the ordinary curriculum of church services. Evangelicals were often elected to such lectureships, and as their election was in itself a testimony to their oratorical powers, they maintained the tradition of the days when people came up to London "to see Garrick act and hear Romaine preach." It is to be feared that the jealousy of the parochial clergy was often aroused by the crowded congregations attracted to these lectures. Certainly they sometimes opposed the lecturers and even tried to deny them the use of church and pulpit. But the visiting preachers were protected by the bishop's licence. Opposition failed and ultimately died down.

The movement could not have succeeded without the work of these preachers, but its immediate contact with the outer world was, naturally enough, not through its clergy but through its lay members. It was especially well served by some of the finest characters in English public life. The centre of this influence was a body of people whom Sydney Smith dubbed the "Clapham Sect." Clapham at that time had a population of 2,000 and was separated from London by three miles of meadow land, its common remaining still a wild area of bush and pond. In this rural paradise a number of well-to-do people had built comfortable homes and formed a close-knit society of their own. Two of them were retired colonial governors, Zachary Macaulay who had ruled Sierra Leone, and Lord Teignmouth who had been Governor-General of India. Big business was represented by Henry Thornton, the banker, and by Charles Grant, chairman of the East India Company. But the most important of all was the M.P. for Yorkshire, William Wilberforce.

Wilberforce was a small but graceful man with a lovely voice. He had inherited great wealth from his father, but sold the family business, and went into politics. With his many advantages, and as a friend of Pitt, a great career seemed open to him, but after his conversion he resolved never to accept office. He gave up many luxuries, even card-playing, spent much time in prayer and Bible-reading, and strove to use his position in Parliament as a means of serving God and his fellow-men. His *Practical View*, which was an

evangelistic appeal addressed to "the higher and middle classes," ran into fifty editions. It made him the obvious lay leader of Evangelicalism, but on the doctrinal side he abandoned characteristic Calvinism for a belief in universal redemption. He was concerned in all the humanitarian movements of the time and his name will be eternally associated with the suppression of the slave trade. How unpopular this particular agitation was likely to be can be deduced from the fact that Whitefield owned slaves and old John Newton had been master of a slaver. True, the latter did not continue in the trade many years after his conversion, but there were many convinced Christians who regarded slavery as part of the divine ordering of society. Also West Indian interests were very strong in Parliament. Consequently it took twenty years of hard work (1787-1807) to educate the public and get the necessary bill through Parliament. It is recorded that when the bill was actually passed the whole House rose to cheer the member whose persuasiveness and patience had achieved so signal a victory. But it was only the first step. After abolishing the trade in slaves it was necessary to go on to the abolition of slavery itself. Wilberforce brought in a motion to this effect in 1824, but it was not until 1833 that success was gained. By that time the hero of the struggle was near his end. He had retired from parliamentary life in 1825 because of failing health. He lived just long enough to receive the news of final success from the Commons, and almost with his last breath thanked God that he had seen the day in which England was willing to give twenty millions sterling for the abolition of slavery.

It is sometimes contended that the Evangelicals were more interested in the welfare of the coloured races than in that of their own kith and kin. This contention can best be refuted by reference to the leading part they played in the reform of social conditions. In this respect the greatest name is that of the Earl of Shaftesbury. Lord Ashley, as he was known before he succeeded to the peerage, is said to have first dedicated his life to the service of the poor when as a Harrow schoolboy he was revolted by the sight of a pauper funeral. Tory and aristocrat as he was, he confessed himself an Evangelical of the Evangelicals, and his faith provided the

driving spirit of all his efforts at reform. In this spirit he entered politics and was elected to Parliament in 1826 as member for Woodstock. He set himself to remedy the terrible conditions of the "mad-houses," where savage punishment and restraint in the supposed interests of society took the place of remedial measures. As a result of his efforts a Commission in Lunacy was appointed with himself as a member. In due course all the asylums were reformed. For a short time he was a lord of admiralty, but in 1841 he refused office because the new ministry would not support his proposals for rapid social reform. He accepted Whig backing and secured the passing of his Factory Bill (1847) which limited the working hours of persons under 15 to ten per day and 58 per week. He was also successful in gaining legislation prohibiting the employment of women in the mines and of boys under 13. He became a somewhat bitter partisan in ecclesiastical affairs and tried to stir up the bishops to attack the Tractarians. As a close friend of Palmerston he nominated a good many of the bishops, and so gave the Evangelicals their richest taste of Church government. However, he was no theologian, and it is kindest to remember only his truly great contributions to social welfare. He and Wilberforce did more than any other two people to rescue the Church from the charge of mere other-worldliness.

It cannot be supposed that this whole movement was maintained without some attempt at combination. If the Evangelical party was not yet highly organized, there were at least concerted efforts to reach and retain a common mind. The collection of sympathetic friends around Clapham Common and its church was of great importance, but it would not have been sufficient of itself. The need was met to some extent by the Eclectic Society, a group of London clergy who met in the vestry of S. John's, Bedford Row, every other week to take tea together and discuss questions of pastoral concern. They were joined by two or three laymen, and even a couple of dissenting ministers were made welcome. We are reminded of the famous teapot which was so great an aid to brilliant conversation in the Common Room at Oriel. The vestry of S. John's must have heard less brilliant but equally important discussions. In any case it was here that Simeon in 1796

brought his proposal for a new missionary society, and here that in 1799 the C.M.S. was actually born. S. John's itself has passed away, but the silver teapot, spoons and tongs are still preserved at Church Missionary House.

A much wider circle was built up at Islington. It began with the arrival of a new incumbent, the account of which is so succinctly given by Balleine in his *History of the Evangelical Party*, that I cannot help quoting it in full³:

“The chief event, however, of this period in London was the appointment of Daniel Wilson to be Vicar of Islington (1824). He had been Vice-Principal of S. Edmund Hall (1807–1812), and in 1812 had succeeded Cecil at S. John’s, Bedford Row; while there he had founded (1813) the London Clerical Education Society. The Islington seat-holders bitterly resented the advent of an Evangelical. Moreover, they had come to regard the church as their private property, and the Vicar as their private chaplain, who acted dishonourably if he ministered to any one outside the circle of his employers; and this when the population was over thirty thousand and the green fields on every side were being cut up into streets. It needed no little tact to establish a new regime without losing all the old congregation, but somehow Wilson accomplished it. A Sunday evening service was started at which all seats were free. The whole parish was mapped out into districts, and house-to-house visitors enrolled. Nine Sunday-schools were at once opened, and in a few years the number was increased to fifteen. At his first Confirmation he presented to the Bishop 780 candidates. An early morning administration of the Holy Communion—a privilege then mainly to be found in Evangelical churches—the use of the Litany on Wednesday and Friday, and a service on every Saint’s Day were some of his innovations. Three new churches were built to seat more than five thousand people. And when he became Bishop of Calcutta in 1832 he left behind him a parish proverbial for strength and efficiency.”

In 1827, the date when Keble published his book of poems, *The Christian Year*, Wilson invited twelve friends to meet with

³ G. R. Balleine, *History of the Evangelical Party*, pp. 197–198.

him and discuss the question of prayer with regard to some contemporary difficulties. This was found so helpful that it was repeated annually. The habit was continued and extended by his son, another Daniel, who succeeded him in the living. Under the younger Daniel the meeting grew until it numbered about 300 clergymen each year. It maintained its vitality because it deliberately eschewed ecclesiastical politics and confined itself to questions of spiritual importance.

By this time Evangelicalism was much more respectable. It not only had noblemen who could act as its advocates but bishops who could lend it their support. The first of such bishops was the Hon. Henry Ryder, who in 1815 was nominated to the see of Gloucester. The appointment roused a storm of protest. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Charles Manners Sutton, resisted the demand for consecration for several months, and he was supported by the Dean and Chapter of Gloucester, who tried later to keep their new bishop out of the cathedral pulpit. However, Ryder so conciliated public opinion that when after nine years he was translated to Lichfield no voice was raised against him. He is chiefly remembered as one of the Evangelical bishops who did much to reform the method of conducting Confirmations, and as the first bishop who was prepared to ordain men directly for work in the mission field.

After a decade he was joined on the episcopal bench by the two Sumners, the younger, Charles Richard, who was appointed to Llandaff in 1826 and translated to Winchester in the following year, and the elder, John Bird, who was appointed to Chester in 1828 and translated to Canterbury twenty years later. It was the former who had made a great impression on George IV when as domestic chaplain he had rebuked that monarch for storming at a servant, and had refused to admit him to communion until he had made amends. As Bishop of Winchester he reformed the diocese, dividing it up into rural deaneries, recalling absentee incumbents, insisting on a second Sunday service in 161 parishes, and restoring many dilapidated buildings. He even visited the Channel Islands, which had never seen their bishop since the Reformation, and administered Confirmation there every three years. Cobbet, who was no particular friend of bishops,

recalls his kindness to a band of sturdy beggars who beset his carriage on the way to his palace at Farnham. Instead of putting them in charge he not only gave them money, but the next day set 24 labourers to steady work, opened his castle to those in distress and provided food for those in want. His brother, who owed to him his introduction to the King, carried on a like work in the diocese of Chester, at that time the largest in the country, thus continuing the reform initiated by Law and Blomfield. In his 20 years there he consecrated as many as 232 new churches. In at least one instance he dealt with the question of proprietary pews by sending for the blacksmith to take off the locks so that the standing people could get in to them, the congregation meanwhile singing a hymn. Even as Archbishop of Canterbury he dispensed with all state, refusing to wear a wig or ride in a State coach, getting up at dawn and lighting his own fire before proceeding to deal with his letters.

During our period there was no open breach between the Evangelicals and the Catholics or the "Apostolicals" as they were sometimes called. It may sound odd to us that the real opponents of the Evangelicals were the Low Churchmen, but that is asserted in the strongest terms by Balleine, the historian of the movement. The assertion may be the more easily understood if we remember that the Low Churchmen were the people who were most antagonistic to every form of "enthusiasm," and were anxious to maintain the *status quo* even with its abuses of privilege, pluralities, absenteeism and paucity of Church services. The Evangelicals and Tractarians were at one in their desire to reform abuses and in their recognition that true religion demanded a far higher standard of conduct than that which sufficed for the world. Newman had himself begun life as an Evangelical, and he never quite lost that sense of predestination and of God's over-ruling providence which was fundamental to Calvin. Simeon and other Evangelical leaders were also at one with Newman in their passionate desire for that holiness without which no man shall see the Lord. They were even alike in their desire to encourage on the part of their people a much more frequent recourse to the sacraments.

There were of course differences both in emphasis and in

general approach. The Evangelicals stressed the psychological aspect of religion, while the Tractarians emphasized the vital or ontological. The Evangelicals relied upon personal conversion, while the Tractarians aspired to be made partakers of the Divine nature. The Evangelicals emphasized faith, the Tractarians grace: the Evangelicals the Bible, the Tractarians the Church. These different aspects of Christianity were not mutually exclusive. They represented different sides of the same shield. Ultimately they came to express themselves in different styles of worship, but the time for that was not yet. For the moment the representatives of both were content with trying to make the services more alive, while gradually freeing themselves from the dead hand of the immediate past. Newman himself was accustomed to celebrate in a surplice and at the north end. By the same token the Evangelicals were more than ready to accept some characteristic Tractarian teaching. The editor of the *Record*, which had been started as an evangelical paper in 1828, had to apologize to his readers for appearing to speak slightlying of the Apostolic Succession. It is significant too that in 1829 the leading Evangelicals voted in favour of Roman Catholic emancipation.

Nevertheless there were already some signs of future opposition. It was perhaps the Tractarians' habit of speaking slightlying of the Reformers that really began it. To most Englishmen of the period the sixteenth century leaders stood little lower than the saints and heroes of the Bible. Particularly was this reverence felt by such Bible-lovers as the Evangelicals, for did they not owe the open Bible to the great reformers? In 1840 they formed the Parker Society, which began the republication of the works of Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer and others as the best way of restoring the prestige of the Reformers among the reading public. The next year they performed the same service for the man in the street by erecting the Martyrs' Memorial in Oxford.

A further indication of troubles to come can be seen in the controversy over the wearing of the surplice in the pulpit. Hitherto it had been the general custom to change from the surplice to a preacher's gown for the sermon. The Tractarians, however, thinking no doubt that the gown was

associated with Geneva, began to retain their surplices when preaching. Blomfield of London in 1843 declared them right. The Evangelical leaders were indifferent. The laity, however, created such a storm that the bishop had to withdraw his instructions. His episcopal colleague, Phillpotts of Exeter, was made of sterner stuff. In his consistory court he refused to deny an incumbent the use of the surplice until such time as the churchwardens awoke to their duty of providing an alb, vestment and cope!

CHAPTER IV

SPIRIT (ANGLO-CATHOLICS)

I

OF all the spiritual influences upon the life of the Church during the period of the second reform by far the most important was that of the Oxford Movement. It was indeed the most strictly contemporary: it was the child of its time. Liberals and Evangelicals, however important, were carrying on the impulse of an earlier generation. Tractarianism was born in this period and could speak most clearly to the age. New brooms sweep clean. The Tractarians had the greatest effect, partly at least, because theirs was the newest influence.

This may seem a paradox when it is recalled that their whole contention was that they were not introducing anything new but recalling the Church to its historic past. But reform is often most effective when it reminds us of the rock from which we are hewn. In any case a historical religion must always look back to its past. This was true even of the Evangelicals who sought to go back to the Bible and to the Christianity of the first generation. The Tractarians looked mainly to the Patristic period, but they were not afraid to call in also the witness of the Middle Ages. It seems extraordinary that they could do this with success at a time when "Gothic" was regarded as equivalent to "barbarous," and Catholic was in common speech synonymous with Papal. Naturally there had been some preparation of the ground. In literature the Romantic movement had developed a new interest in history, and the fresh discovery of the beauty of the natural world had opened the way to a new appreciation of the sacraments. Newman himself enumerated Scott, Wordsworth and Coleridge among the influences that formed a *preparatio evangelica* for the new emphasis of theology. Of the three Coleridge was the most powerful intellectual stimulus.

Samuel Taylor Coleridge was a wayward but brilliant

genius who was by turns poet, philosopher, critic, journalist, lecturer and theologian. Ill-health drove him to become a drug addict and prevented him from achieving the constructive heights to which he might otherwise have attained. Born in 1772 he lost his father at the age of nine and became a pupil at Christ's Hospital. During a school holiday he swam the New River in all his clothes and brought on an attack of rheumatic fever, from the consequences of which he never completely recovered. At school Charles Lamb, Leigh Hunt and Middleton (later Bishop of Calcutta) were his companions. He shone among them all and was provided with a bursary to send him to Cambridge. There he was as desultory and as brilliant as he had been at school. In a fit of despondency he left the University and enlisted as a dragoon, only to be bought out by his officer brother as soon as his whereabouts were discovered. He joined up with Robert Southey and a Quaker friend at Bristol, where he tried to live on the proceeds of his writing and formed a completely mad project of building a perfect communist or socialist society at Susquehanna, a place whose whereabouts in America he could not even identify. The project vanished when the three friends married three sisters and tried, unsuccessfully as far as Coleridge was concerned, to find the perfect state of existence in domestic bliss. His rheumatic pains led him to seek solace in laudanum, a habit from which he never escaped. He became a friend of Wordsworth, and henceforth found refuge usually under his roof or under that of some other acquaintance. He became a Unitarian and even preached from time to time in the chapels of that sect.

The Wedgewoods befriended him and for a time provided him with an income of £150 a year. He travelled in Germany and pursued his studies at Göttingen, meeting some of the best brains on the Continent, and acquiring a knowledge of the incipient science of Biblical criticism. Later, seeking health in a warmer climate, he went to Malta, where he became secretary to the Governor, and showed himself a good man of business. He could not settle and returned home to take up intermittent writing and lecturing. His failing grew upon him, and finally he put himself under the care of a doctor in Highgate, with whom he lived from 1818 till his

death in 1834. There he was the centre of an admiring circle of young people whose minds he enlarged by his brilliant conversation. He had fought his way back to Anglicanism, and taught a doctrine of the Church which made clear its separate existence as a spiritual entity entirely distinct from the State. In poetry his best known work is the *Ancient Mariner*, with its equally strong sense of the numinous and of the æsthetic quality of nature. In philosophy he is best remembered by his *Aids to Reflection*, which is a collection of aphorisms largely derived from Archbishop Leighton. It establishes much the same position as the poem by asserting that facts cannot be conceived without value. In theology his greatest work is the *Constitution of Church and State*, which, by insisting upon the spiritual independence of the Church, carries essentially the same suggestion into the ecclesiastical sphere. He can be regarded as the sower of seeds which germinated in the movements most characteristic of the nineteenth century. He was the true originator both of the *Lux Mundi* and of the Christian Socialist schools. If the Tractarians learnt much from him, Frederick Denison Maurice was perhaps his truest disciple.

II

This explains the spirit behind the movement. Its actual beginning has often been described. Every schoolboy now knows that it did not start with Keble's sermon. That was a private anniversary of Newman's. No doubt that sermon meant a great deal to him, just back, as he was, from the Continent, full of visions and clamorous for great deeds. And here he found "dear J.K.," the most splendid of Oxford's sons, proclaiming before the Judge of Assize that England was in danger of apostatizing from the true faith and doing despite to the Church of God.

But quite a number of people had been thinking that for some time. They knew that the Reform Bill meant the enfranchisement of a whole host of Nonconformists and a consequent alteration of the religious character of Parliament. They knew too that the Government intended to reform the organization of the Irish Church without reference to the Church herself. Even if one had been an advocate for

reform, one might have resented this way of setting about it. And there is no doubt that a very great number did, although nobody but Newman and Mozley mentions Keble's sermon in this connection.

The first meeting to deal with the situation was summoned by the Cambridge man, Rose, at Hadleigh. Out of it sprang nothing of immediate importance, although in the following year largely signed addresses in support of the apostolical doctrine and polity of the Church were presented to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The Oxford men had little faith in addresses and associations. They saw clearly that what was needed was not a mere defence of the Church but a revival of religion based on Church principles. All the present troubles had come about through an almost complete neglect of fundamental elements in the Church's teaching. The first thing necessary was to get these fully recognized. It is remarkable with what precision the Oriel group noted the evil and the means for its remedy. England must be persuaded to believe again in the Church, and the most practical way of securing this end was to emphasize the gifts which God bestowed on man through the medium of the Church.

Hurrell Froude tells us how the friends determined to set forth the truths to which they wished to draw attention. There were to be three planks in the platform. Their precise nature was stated in the following terms : “(1) that participation in the Body and Blood of Christ is essential to the maintenance of Christian life and hope in each individual ; (2) that it is conveyed to individual Christians only by the hands of the successors of the Apostles and their delegates ; (3) that the successors of the Apostles are those who are descended in a direct line from them by the imposition of hands ; and that the delegates of these are the respective presbyters whom each has commissioned.”

Several points call for comment in this pronouncement. In the first place it is definitely religious. We are so accustomed to hear the Oxford Movement described as a matter of ecclesiastical politics or as a concern with the mere externals of ecclesiastical life, that it is refreshing to draw from the fountain-head this tremendous emphasis upon vital religion.

It starts from man's need of union with Christ. In the second place it binds together Church and sacraments, making the Apostolic Succession not a mere fetish but a necessary part of the sacramental system. And thirdly it rescues the sacraments from the comparative disrespect into which they had fallen and makes them an essential part of the Christian life.

It is difficult from our point of vantage to realize how much this emphasis on the sacramental principle was needed at the time and how great a change its adoption involved in the lives and conduct of those who were influenced by it. Canon Prestige, in his life of Pusey, has said that in the Divine Providence the purpose of the Church of England seems to be to preserve alive the sacraments for English people. If that is so, then that purpose must have seemed to many to be failing at the opening of the nineteenth century. The sacraments were at that time infrequently and slovenly administered, and they had ceased to have that central place in theology and religion which had belonged to them throughout the Church's history. They were regarded by the vast majority of the people as an "optional appendage" to Christian life, not as central and necessary. The Wesleys and some of the Evangelicals had come near to grasping that truth but they had not succeeded in impressing it upon their followers.

To the Tractarian leaders the sacraments were not simply ordinances of a more or less arbitrary nature but were rooted in the very constitution of the universe as affected by grace. The whole material creation was to them a sign of the invisible God, and they had no difficulty in believing that through some special elements of that created universe the love of the Father might still be particularly bestowed as it had been once through the human flesh and blood of the Incarnate Son. Thus to them the sacraments were in a real sense an "extension of the Incarnation."

It is needless to say that the conduct of the earliest leaders conformed to this view. Keble's whole attitude to life as revealed in the *Christian Year* is dictated by it. Pusey received it as a precious heirloom from his mother and treasured it all his life, obtaining permission from his bishop to celebrate regularly in his own study. And Newman

borrowed afresh from Butler the habit of tracing an analogy between the world of nature and the sacramental system.

We may safely affirm that the practice of the whole Anglican Church has been radically affected by this teaching. Even where it is not accepted in theory, to a great extent it dominates the practice. There is scarcely a church in our own country where Holy Communion is not frequently and reverently administered, and in the mission field to receive communion is the dearest wish of every convert. In contrast with this the laxity of the pre-Tractarian days is commonly quoted by writers of all schools as constituting a grave scandal. To the joy and strength that have entered into the lives of countless communicants since this revival of sacramental doctrine and practice every parish priest could easily bear witness.

This threefold platform may be regarded as the first fundamental principle of Tractarianism. There is a second which has not yet received the recognition that is its due. Yet it was brought to light by the brilliant Swedish historian of the Movement, Yngve Brilioth; it was made the main point of Dr. Webb's suggestive little book, *Religious Thought in the Oxford Movement*, and it has been used as a key to the understanding of Newman by his biographer, Dr. Cross. This principle is what scholars call Moralism, and what ordinary people would probably call just Saintliness.

To those who are accustomed to think of the followers of the Oxford Movement as men who pay an undue reverence to outward forms we must repeat once again that the original Tractarians were men who put tremendous emphasis upon the inwardness of true religion. This assertion is so profoundly true that without grasping its significance it is utterly impossible to understand the true genius of the Movement. To the original Tractarians the moral consciousness was the spring and fountain of the religious life. Without this it was not only impossible to practise true religion, but even to think true religion, for a proper understanding of religious truth could only come out of a pure heart. Even the doctrinal and historical points about which so much controversy was raised were of secondary importance compared with the imperious demand for holiness of life.

This fundamental principle showed itself in the attitude of each of the great leaders. It was the revelation contained in his private papers of the extraordinary struggles after moral excellence that induced his friends to publish Hurrell Froude's *Remains*, and to brave the consequences of indiscreet revelation. The height of Newman's ideal in this respect may be judged from the fact that while still an Anglican he could find no real saintliness in the Roman Church. He had learned from T. Scott the maxim "Holiness before peace," and he despised all efforts to turn religion into a mere source of comfort. "Those who make comfort the great subject of their preaching seem to mistake the end of their ministry. Holiness is the great end. There must be a struggle and a toil here. Comfort is a cordial, but no one drinks cordials from morning to night." Of Keble it has been said that his true life can never be written, for it belonged to an inner sanctuary. But we know something of his self-discipline. His normal rule was to take no food on Fridays until the evening, and his self-denial issued in amazing generosity to others. Such generosity was even exceeded by Pusey, who gave away many thousands of pounds, and whose personal austerities were extreme.

It was partly no doubt this kind of thing that aroused a certain antipathy against the Tractarians in the minds of some at least of their countrymen. The typical Englishman regards religion as something intensely practical. It is a life to be lived in the world. It is identical with his duties as husband, father, citizen. Consequently he is suspicious of any teaching that seems to make of religion a thing apart, that sets a wide gulf between the Church and the world. Yet the emphasis on morality is in itself thoroughly and typically Anglican. We all admire a good man even if we are too ready to agree that one must not strive to be righteous overmuch.

One does not wish to say for a moment that there is no emphasis upon morality in other Churches, but simply that other Christians are accustomed to look elsewhere for their assurance of salvation. Thus the Methodist, for instance, relies upon his inner conviction of the forgiveness of his sins, while the Romanist relies upon his belief that he is in the

bark of Peter. The Anglican, on the other hand, is fond of insisting upon the view that "it is character and character alone that can truly save us." We need not think that the Anglican necessarily has the whole right of the matter. His view may sometimes lead to a superiority that borders upon hypocrisy. He at least needs an emphasis upon the loving fatherhood of God to balance his moralism. Nevertheless, in their very lack of ease and their insistence upon the intensity of the moral struggle, there was something about the Tractarian leaders which should make its appeal to every Englishman.

These then are the two fundamental principles of the Oxford Movement, sacramentalism and moralism. It is often said that the two cannot be held together. But they were held together and neither was compromised. There was never the least deviation on the part of the leaders from their stressing of the requirements of holiness. But it was realized that life at the required pitch could only be lived in constant reliance upon the sacraments and that aid which Christ gives in His Church.

III

We have seen that the Oxford Movement was a genuine religious movement, not a mere flutter in ecclesiastical dovecots or an insidious attack by intriguing clerics against the rights of civil government. Those who make the latter suggestions have failed to realize the two principles upon which the leaders themselves laid so much stress, devotion to the sacraments and effort after holiness of life.

From these two principles there has passed down to our own day a chain of consequences that have profoundly affected the religious life not only of our own country but of the whole Commonwealth and Empire. It is tempting for a sympathizer with the Movement to point to the advance that has been made in the course of the last century and to claim the credit of it for his heroes alone. That would be manifestly unfair. As we have already made clear, many contributory causes have united to bring us to our present position; but at least we can claim for the Oxford Movement the credit of initiating the churchly element in the revival.

It is interesting to take the two principles we have named and to see how they were worked out in the course of the Movement.

The very strong emphasis upon the sacramental principle involved at the outset a clear recognition of the apostolicity of the Church. If God uses outward and visible means as the tokens of His grace there is logically needed an authoritative organization to guarantee the outward means. And the authority of that organization must be itself guaranteed by its derivation from the original Founder. That at least is the argument that lies behind the Tractarian aims as officially stated.

It is very important to realize this, for it is this alone that enables us to consider the question of the Apostolic Succession, about which so much was to be heard, in its due proportion. It should be viewed only as part and parcel of the whole sacramental principle. The succession, by preserving the unity and authority of the Church, acts as the guardian of the sacraments. It was for this reason that the early followers of the Movement were willing to bear the nickname of "Apostolicals." Popular discernment had not erred in fastening upon this as one of the main elements in their teaching.

The practical result was to hold up before the eyes of all men a vision of the Church as a self-contained unit quite independent of the State, subject in all essential matters to its own laws and jurisdiction. In view of the Elizabethan Settlement and the Establishment this view was not at all easy to substantiate. And it was made all the more difficult by the readiness of the State to intervene on its own initiative in Church affairs. It is significant that it was a new teaching, at least for that period. The old-fashioned High Churchmen had been practical Erastians ever since the days of Laud, and of course they inherited that attitude of mind from Hooker and the Elizabethans. Even Newman himself had to learn the doctrine of the Church's spiritual independence from Whately the Liberal, as others learnt it from Coleridge the philosopher.

It is amazing in these circumstances how rapidly the doctrine spread. Nowadays the vast majority of Church

people would accept it without question, whatever they might think about the historic certainty of the actual succession of bishops. It was this that formed the driving force behind the demands for the revival of Convocation and of diocesan synods, and it was this that led to the summoning of the Lambeth Conferences, and the formation of a scheme for the self-government of the Church. In these efforts there have been associated influences not immediately derived from the Oxford Movement, but it is to the Movement that the main impetus was due.

If the fresh recognition of the vital importance of the Church as a distinct society thus led to increased care for the perfection of its organization, the renewed interest in organization led in turn to increased zeal for its effective equipment in other directions. Parishes had grown vast and unwieldy ; there were too few clergy and too few churches. As we have seen the former need was partly met by the provision of theological colleges for the training of ordinands. By the end of the century there were founded no fewer than twenty-one.

The provision of churches went on with even greater rapidity. A French writer has recently pointed out that whereas in the first thirty years of the century no more than five hundred churches were built, the period from 1831 to 1851 saw the construction of no fewer than two thousand. This tremendous effort to build a sufficiency of new churches was accompanied by a strenuous activity in the restoration of old buildings that had been allowed to fall into disrepair. Nowadays we are wont to regret the ruthless character of many of these "restorations," and to bemoan the fact that zealous benefactors did not wait a little longer until the genius of Gothic architecture was more thoroughly understood. But the fact is that many of the buildings were in such a state as would admit of no delay if they were to be saved at all. In any case it was through all this feverish activity that there was acquired that skill in "Gothic" architecture which characterizes some of the greatest builders of to-day.

If these are ways in which the sacramentalist principle worked itself out in practice, what are we to say of the other great principle, that of moralism? Here I should set in the forefront devotion to the poor. When Dr. Pusey saw in a

shop window a lady's dress priced at £60 he could scarcely believe his eyes. "Apart from all trinketry," he said, "one Christian lady was to wear as one of her manifold exterior dresses what would have removed the gnawings of hunger of some 7,000 members of Christ." And he was ready to show by precise mathematical calculation how accurate his conclusion was. His own wife had sold her jewels and he his horses for the purposes of charity in the comparatively early stages of their career.

It is significant how many of the followers of the Tractarians were content to minister to the poor. That very independent witness, Charles Booth, left it on record in his monumental survey of the sociological conditions of London that in the worst slums it was only the "Anglo-Catholic" clergy who had any authority. The names of Lowder, Mackonockie, Dolling, Stanton head a long list of utterly devoted servants of the poor.

It is in this connection that we can best consider a characteristic of the Movement that has earned it more dislike than any other, its so-called "Ritualism." It is well known that the first academic leaders of the revival had no interest in, or taste for, ceremonial. In a university the appeal must always be to the mind. But when their followers began to go among the uneducated the intellectual appeal had no force at all. Mr. Chamberlain, a Christ Church don, wishing to serve the poor in the slums of S. Thomas's parish, Oxford, found his academic ways of no value whatever. But he soon realized that he could appeal, even to the least intelligent, through the eye. "Visual aids" in education are as important to the adult as to the child. Many earnest clergymen up and down the country found that a dramatic presentation of the sacraments told far more in the work of conversion than the most carefully elaborated doctrinal teaching.

About this time there had begun to appear a keen interest in liturgical studies. It started in Oxford with the publication of Worcester Palmer's *Origines Liturgicae* in 1832, and was carried on at Cambridge by Neale and the Camden Society. People who gave themselves to these studies believed that they found in the Prayer Book itself authority to carry on the services with the same picturesqueness as characterized

the medieval Church. This was just what they needed for teaching their poor, and whether they were right or wrong in their views about the meaning of the Prayer Book, there can be no doubt that men holding such views were under a moral obligation to put them into effect.

It is a thousand pities that the bishops of the period were not able to work up some interest in the same kind of studies. It was their ignorance of liturgiology that prevented them achieving any adequate sympathy with the growing Puseyite party. This failure did more than anything else to fix upon the party the character of a permanent opposition. Nevertheless it was a considerable time before any one ventured to charge the Tractarians with disobeying the rubrics. Indeed the early attacks upon the ritualists charged them with too great an anxiety for the precise observance of the rubrics. "Rubricians" was the opprobrious epithet by which they were most readily known. Dean Stanley regarded the eager attempt to enforce the rubrics as one of the most lamentable features of the Movement. Even the courts recognized this, and decided mainly in their favour until 1871.

Another result of the Tractarian desire for holiness, which, although it brought some trouble, was not destined to lead to quite such an excess of controversy, was the revival of the monastic life. It was felt that there must be allowed to those who believed themselves called to the service of God apart from domestic ties adequate opportunity to fulfil their vocation. Miss Hughes was the first to take religious vows, which she did at S. Mary's, Oxford, on Trinity Sunday, 1841. Three years later, with the help of Mr. Gladstone and in memory of the poet Southey, a house was founded in London for Sisters of Mercy. Such communities rapidly increased in number, and their members won golden opinions by their devotion in the cholera plague and in the Crimean War. To-day there are no fewer than forty-five orders for women in England alone, apart from the missionary dioceses.

Similar opportunities for men were not provided until after our period, beginning with R. M. Benson's foundation of the Cowley Fathers in 1866. But there are now eight different communities for men, each offering its own distinctive interpretation of the monastic life. The value of the work done

by these institutions was warmly recognized by the Lambeth Conference of 1930. They stand for us to-day as the most monumental witness of the devotion to God and His cause which the Oxford Movement has aroused in the hearts of English people.

IV

Religious conflicts are often due to differences of emphasis. It was inevitable that the increased stress laid by the Tractarians on the sacraments should create a certain tension within the Anglican Communion. It would have to be decided whether this development arose from a deep underlying difference of doctrine and whether, if so, the two views were so fundamentally opposed that they could not be held together in the Church of England. The challenge came in connection with the doctrine of baptism, and it was brought into the open by Phillpotts, the Bishop of Exeter.

Phillpotts was an *enfant terrible*. He could be amusing, but his rashness led to trouble on more than one occasion and particularly in the famous Gorham case. Gorham, an incumbent of the Exeter diocese, brought unfavourable notice on himself in the first instance by advertising for a curate "free from Tractarian error," and then objecting because the bishop put the candidate through a theological test as well as demanding the usual subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles. When the next year (1847) the Lord Chancellor presented Gorham to the living of Bramford Speke near Exeter, the bishop refused to institute him without putting him also to a thorough examination. This was indeed a trial of strength. The test was held on eight separate days between December and March and covered altogether fifty-two hours with only short intervals for meals.

The point at issue was the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. The bishop had caught something of a Tartar, for Gorham had been engaged in this subject of controversy before and had made himself a master in it. Both parties accepted the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, but the questions upon which they differed were When? and How? Phillpotts thought that the new birth was necessarily coincident with the act of baptism itself, while Gorham thought

it was dependent upon faith and might be given before, at or after baptism, the baptism itself being a sign or pledge of the grace given in response to faith. At the end of the examination the bishop declared Gorham's views unorthodox and refused to institute. Gorham took the case to the Court of Arches and lost. He then appealed to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. It reversed the decision, and judged that Gorham's views could not be declared impossible of acceptance within the Church of England. Although the bishop went to three other courts to prevent the decision being put into effect he could not gain his case. He still refused, however, to institute. Finally the matter was taken out of his hands, and Gorham was duly put in possession of his benefice and of the cure of souls (1850) by the Archbishop.

The case created a tremendous stir and every one was obliged to take sides. Although Phillpotts was no Anglo-Catholic and Gorham was not an Evangelical, their respective views did roughly represent the differing attitudes to the sacraments characteristic of the two movements. The resultant controversy in the country inevitably sharpened the party lines. Extremists at both ends revolted against the Privy Council judgment. Some Tractarians gave up the Church of England in despair and inaugurated a second secession to Rome (the first having been that of Newman and some of his immediate friends in 1845), while a few Evangelicals fell away and joined the Baptist and other non-conforming bodies. In neither case were the numbers important.

The rest held together. By so doing they reaffirmed the comprehensive character deliberately asserted for the Church of England in the sixteenth century. It is interesting to observe that this was once again due to the influence of laymen. If, as is now generally agreed, the first reform was very largely devised by the laity and imposed upon the clergy, so was this decisive action in the second. A wit has described the Elizabethan Settlement as a typical woman's job. The Gorham Judgment, with all its consequences, was a typical lawyer's job. It refused to sharpen the razor edge of orthodoxy. It did not ask, "What is the correct doctrine of baptismal regeneration?" but "Is the view under consideration

incompatible with the formularies of the Church of England?"

In giving a negative answer to that question it kept the qualifications for membership as wide as possible. The answer may not have satisfied the theological purists, but it was in keeping with the peculiar ethos of Anglicanism. The laity, whenever possible, prevent the clergy from excommunicating each other, and by so doing provide the broadest possible path for their own feet. So the second reform, like the first, rests ultimately upon a rejection of over-nicety in definition, and a determination to reconcile differing shades of opinion. That may sometimes make it difficult for us to preserve a common mind. But at least in the opinion of many it keeps us close to the pattern of the New Testament.

BOOKS FOR FURTHER READING

- Balleine, G. R. *History of the Evangelical Party.* 1951.
Brilioth, Y. *The Anglican Revival.* 1925.
Carpenter, S. C. *Church and People (1789–1889).* 1933.
Church, R. *The Oxford Movement.* 1891.
Cnatttingius, H. *Bishops and Societies.* 1952.
Cornish, F. Warre. *History of the English Church in the Nineteenth Century.* Part I. 1910.
Legg, J. Wickham. *English Church Life (from the Restoration to the Tractarian Movement).* 1914.
Matthieson, W. L. *English Church Reform (1815–1840).* 1923.
Nias, J. C. S. *Gorham and the Bishop of Exeter.* 1951.
Ollard, Crosse and Bond. *Dictionary of English Church History.* 1948.
Ollard, S. L. *The Anglo-Catholic Revival.* 1925.
Overton, J. H. *English Church in the Nineteenth Century.* 1894.
Russell, G. W. E. *Short History of the Evangelical Movement.* 1915.
Smyth, C. *Simeon and Church Order.* 1940.
Storr, V. F. *Development of English Theology in the Nineteenth Century.* 1913.
Wakeman, A. O. *History of the Church of England.* 1896.
Wand, J. W. C. *History of the Modern Church.* 1952.
Webb, C. C. J. *Religious Thought in the Oxford Movement.* 1928.

PRINCIPAL DATES

- 1776 American Independence.
- 1789 Fall of Bastille.
- 1799 Church Missionary Society.
- 1804 British and Foreign Bible Society.
- 1805 Sutton Archbishop of Canterbury.
- 1807 Slave Trade abolished.
- 1811 National Society.
- 1815 Waterloo.
- Congress of Vienna.
- 1816 St. Bees Theological College.
- 1818 Church Building Act.
- 1820 Accession of George IV.
- 1827 Keble's *Christian Year*.
- 1828 Repeal of Test Act.
- Howley Archbishop of Canterbury.
- 1829 Catholic Emancipation.
- King's College.
- 1830 Accession of William IV.
- 1832 Reform Act.
- Durham University.
- 1833 Slavery abolished.
- Keble's Assize Sermon.
- 1836 Ecclesiastical Commissioners.
- University of London incorporated.
- 1837 Accession of Queen Victoria.
- 1838 Church Building Act.
- 1841 Jerusalem Bishopric.
- Tract XC.
- Colonial and Continental Church Society.
- 1845 Newman becomes Roman Catholic.
- 1848 Sumner Archbishop of Canterbury.
- 1850 Gorham Judgment.